



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

**A** 449914

U. of M. Duplicate  
THE LIBRARY OF



ACCESSION SHELF.

137 U. of M. Duplicate  
F37  
2

JN  
172  
T4







[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]





## **POLITICS IN A DEMOCRACY**



# POLITICS IN A DEMOCRACY

UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO  
*AN ESSAY*  
IN

BY

DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON

AUTHOR OF "A SYSTEM OF PSYCHOLOGY;" "THE PROBLEM OF EVIL;"  
"THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF THE HUMAN MIND;" "SOCIAL  
PROGRESS;" "THE PHILOSOPHY OF FICTION IN LITERATURE,"  
ETC., ETC., ETC.

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16TH STREET

1893

[*All rights reserved*]

TO YTHSIVBU  
ATOCBBIN  
YASBU

(13177)  
COPYRIGHT, 1893, BY

DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON

Press of J. J. Little & Co.  
Astor Place, New York

014 May 08 85

LIBRARY OF  
WILLIAM F. VILAS  
LIBRARY

TO

WILLIAM F. VILAS

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

MY PERSONAL AND FAMILY FRIEND OF LONG STANDING

I RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBE

THIS VOLUME

Vol. 2-19-02 1176

1176014

TO YTI23VIMU  
ATO23BIM  
YIABU

## CONTENTS.

ARGUMENT, . . . . .	PAGE ix-xiv
CHAPTER I.	
MONARCHY, . . . . .	I
CHAPTER II.	
THE SUPERNATURAL MONARCH, . . . . .	9
CHAPTER III.	
DEMOCRACY, . . . . .	13
CHAPTER IV.	
THE DEGRADATION OF LAW, . . . . .	26
CHAPTER V.	
COMBINATION AND ORGANIZATION, . . . . .	30
CHAPTER VI.	
THE POLITICAL PARTY, . . . . .	35
CHAPTER VII.	
GOVERNMENT BY SYNDICATE, . . . . .	43



## CHAPTER VIII.

	PAGE
THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES, . . .	52

## CHAPTER IX.

TAMMANY HALL, . . . . .	63
-------------------------	----

## CHAPTER X.

THE SUPPORTERS OF TAMMANY HALL, . . . .	75
---	----

## CHAPTER XI.

THE CRITICS AND OPPONENTS OF TAMMANY HALL, . .	92
--	----

## CHAPTER XII.

THE EVIL AND THE GOOD IN TAMMANY GOVERNMENT, .	108
--	-----

## CHAPTER XIII.

SOME SPECIAL COUNTERACTIVES AGAINST EVIL, . .	131
---	-----

## CHAPTER XIV.

GENERAL REMEDIES AND ULTIMATE TENDENCIES, . .	140
---	-----

## ARGUMENT.

A CONSPICUOUS characteristic of people living under a monarchial *régime* is the sentiment called Loyalty. This is exhibited in reverence for and self-denying devotion to a personal sovereign. It involves a high development of the sense of duty, impelling men to do what they think they ought without hesitation, and even with enthusiasm, irrespective of personal consequences. The path of duty, wherever it may lead, is the only way to glory.

The progress from monarchy to democracy has been marked by a decline of this sentiment of loyalty. Such decline has been stayed by religion, loyalty to a supernatural monarch taking the place of devotion to a human sovereign. The decline has further been stayed by patriotism, love of a common country, which is rendered very intense by a state of defensive conflict for self-preservation. But when religious authority wanes, and the safety of a democracy is established past all fear, with prosperity assured, the sentiment of loyalty dies out. With it also departs in large measure the sense of duty. Individual ends take



**POLITICS IN A DEMOCRACY**

administration obtains in most of our great cities. It is commercial in principle, but not necessarily vicious. At all events it is a natural and readily explicable product of evolution.

As illustrations of the political party proper in the United States, we have the Democratic and Republican parties; the former is the party of the masses, of personal liberty, and of individualism; the latter, the party of the aristocracy, of authority, and of socialism.

The best illustration of government by syndicate is Tammany Hall in New York City. Its methods explained, its vote analyzed, and its supporters classified. The city election of 1890 for mayor taken as the test of Tammany strength, all other elements of the voting population being then combined against it. The critics and opponents of Tammany examined, and Tammany Hall defended. Its existence, or the existence of a political power like it, shown to be inevitable. The evil and the good in Tammany government set forth, the good preponderating.

The special remedies for political evils lie in the direction of less government rather than more. The great difficulty now is found in legislation. Something should be done to control legislative action, to prevent legislating for individuals and classes of individuals. The general

remedy lies in the education of men so as to restore, if possible, the sense of duty; to find some way to renew the spirit which existed in the sentiment of loyalty to the king. This can only occur through the higher development of the altruistic character and the formation of such an ideal of life as will cause human beings to find their satisfaction in doing things well; in enjoying to the fullest what is at hand, rather than struggling for the unattainable; in being worthy of success, rather than attaining it by restless striving.

But though there are dangerous evils conspicuous in American democracy, the outlook, after all, is encouraging. The neglect of politics by men of intelligence and wealth, the indifference to corruption, scheming, and selfishness which we observe, and which are often cited as evidences of national decay, do not argue a general deterioration, or an increasing depravity of the people leading to anarchy in the sense of revolution, violence, or even insecurity of life or property. This condition of affairs is, rather, symptomatic of an evolutionary movement toward a situation where government is becoming of less consequence because of the self-control and self-regulation of people in their conduct toward each other; toward that anarchy wherein government ceases

because unnecessary. This is the true argument to be drawn from what is sometimes called our political decadence. The more stable society is, the more secure people are in the great rights of Life, Liberty, and Property, the more certain is government to become of less consequence and its administration to be relegated to professional politicians, who work for wages, as they would in any other business. In a country of liberty and political equality, the statesman in the old sense must become obsolete as civilization advances and society becomes more perfect.

# POLITICS IN A DEMOCRACY.

## CHAPTER I.

### MONARCHY.

IN these days, when the reality of government by the people seems in America to fall so far below the standard of excellence which a high ideal of democracy forces us to set up, the wonder grows, in the mind of the thoughtful person, whether, after all, anything has been gained for human happiness by the abolition of monarchy and the vested rights of aristocratic classes. Under the recognition of *status* there is more stability, and thus more certainty in predicting the future from the past. Hence man, knowing what is to come, can so shape his conduct as to meet the events of life with the least amount of effort, disturbance, and anxiety. His adaptation becomes more complete, his mind is more contented, and his joy keener. In the absence of this stability he knows, indeed, that greater opportunity is afforded him to rise in the world by his



own striving; but he also learns the bitter lesson that the energy of those below is just as likely to knock him down from the position he actually holds. Not only is eternal vigilance the price of liberty, but eternal contention is the price of security. There is no rest for the weary. It is a constant struggle for survival. Nothing is attained, but one is always seeking. Or, if something be grasped, there is need of so much exertion to hold it that ease for enjoyment is not possible. There is no chance for that cultivation of happiness and enlargement of its sources which quiet and repose inevitably bring and alone can secure. But with the other *régime*, if the king proudly claims that his rights are paramount, that he is answerable to no man, but serenely enjoys his prerogatives "by the grace of God;" it is also true that the humblest workman, though his sphere of action be limited, by this very limitation is furnished with an incentive to growth within that sphere, which, if it goes on, brings him the satisfaction of mastery, making him happy as a king and as proud as any ruler of men. Dr. George Hepworth has beautifully written the story of a poor man who went through life rejoicing in his humble calling, attaining the fulness of his desires, esteeming himself more blessed than if he wore a royal crown, and asking

when he died that there be inscribed on his tombstone the words, "Shoemaker by the grace of God"! \* Thus, where conditions are fixed, even though there be barriers which may not be passed, there is something in the thought that those barriers may after all be a protection, and that within them lies an opportunity for getting good out of life more certain and more ample than any to be found if they were swept away and the humanity they enclosed precipitated into a mobile ocean of rolling and tumultuous waves.

If kings had not been so prone to war it may well be doubted if democracy would have appeared so desirable, or would have been put in practice so extensively. War is the most terrific disorganizer of society, and its destructiveness is the greatest bane to human happiness. Thus, when the people who were to be the chief sufferers from its ravages saw that national conflicts were entered into upon a theory of national honor which depended on the personal likes and dislikes, the ambitions and caprices of autocratic rulers, they naturally began to agitate for such a *régime* as would prevent whole communities from being plunged into bloody strife at the will of one man, or a few. They reasoned that the system of government was the chief cause of their woes,

---

\* "Hiram Golf's Religion."

until they came to believe that if any one was to be killed it ought to be the kings and princes, whose selfishness was always prominent and whose concern for the popular welfare very slight. Hence came revolutions; at first perhaps looking merely to a change in dynasty, but in time becoming satisfied only with some form of democratic control.

Nevertheless, even with war and under oppression there is something in the monarchical idea which has always appealed attractively to the minds of men dwelling together in society. The notions of greater power and greater perfection, intermingled in varying proportions according to the characters of different individuals, have rendered subjection to a monarch not only easy but preferable. Mankind worships the hero, whether he be superior in strength or preëminent in wisdom and goodness. The people, knowing their own limitations, demand a leader, and having found one they glory in him. This is not less true in a democracy than under autocratic government. Power and perfection seem to go together. The might that must be obeyed is that which ought to be obeyed. The conqueror is first submitted to, *ex necessitate*, then revered and perhaps loved. That which originally was merely the Great tends to become finally the Good.

Out of this union of fear and love arises a sentiment which dominates the actions of men in a degree often sufficient to overcome the selfish instincts and inclinations. It is a sentiment of Loyalty to a Sovereign which has sent countless multitudes to death unflinchingly and even triumphantly. It takes hold of the ignorant and unthinking more strongly than upon the enlightened and cultivated. It sways masses of men who are selfish, brutal, and ferocious; it stimulates their courage to an extreme development; it impels them to deeds of daring and devotion that no Christian martyr, filled with divine altruism, ever surpassed. No tribes of savages are so low as to be wholly without it, and under its influence the polished and courtly knight joyfully faces the cannon or yields his life to the sword or spear.

No one can claim justly that this potent sentiment is an entirely unselfish one, or that the acts which it inspires are free from motives of individual advantage. The love of glory and the ambition for personal aggrandizement are frequently conspicuous in the hero. To the common soldier the hope of plunder and unrestrained license to gratify the baser passions may be the ultimate incentive. For the ends which the human mind sets before itself, however self-denying they ap-

pear, still must bear some relation to self-satisfaction. But over and above all these egoistic motives, governing and controlling conduct is the belief, with strong emotional accompaniments, that only through subjection, obedience, devotion to the sovereign, can the good things of life be obtained in whatever direction they may be thought to lie. From force of education and habit this homage comes to be rendered almost automatically. Thus loyalty grows to be an unreasoning sentiment, which issues in action unreasoned, spontaneous, and certain.

It is difficult to estimate the component feelings of this masterful sentiment, because they vary so much with respect to each other in different individuals; but undoubtedly the general basis is fear and the characteristic manifestation submission and obedience. The lower the civilization the more strongly does this last-named emotion make itself evident. The great chief is the irresistible man, who maintains his position by his distinguished prowess. He may be a monster of cruelty, some Zulu Chaka, but he is obeyed as "The Heavens above," because he is universally feared. His power to crush and kill, the certainty that he will exercise it, and the impossibility of escape, ensure the loyalty of his subjects. Recognizing the supremacy of their king, they ascribe to him

attributes which they think will be pleasing and propitiatory. Being allowed the favor of his presence, or exercising his bounty, the original terror becomes softened to awe and admiring reverence. For him they will work and strive, his behests they will follow, that they may not only avoid his wrath, but share in the benefits of his superior power.

This last motive increases in strength and efficiency as civilization grows. As enlarged intelligence gains a more complete mastery over brute force, the chief maintains his hold, not so much as before because he is mighty in battle, but because he is of use to those who support and obey him, and because he somehow awakens their love or friendly enthusiasm. Though the impression of his great power still remains, he is thought of more as a realization of ideal virtue, or as a guarantor of the attainment of those ends of life cherished and pursued by the subject. The latter thus humbles himself before the king as an inferior creature, and worships royalty under the belief that his own well-being is thereby assured. Under such a stimulus, modified from the primitive motives, loyalty continues to maintain itself as a tremendous sentiment, governing the conduct of the gentle, the refined, the cultivated, as it does that of the fierce and bloodthirsty barbarian.

It is not the present intention to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of monarchy, or to trace its influence, or show its characteristics under its various forms from extreme absolutism to the most liberal constitutionalism. My purpose just now is to call attention to a prevailing characteristic of the people who live under a monarchical *régime*, the existence in the individual character, and the great influence over that character as determining conduct, of the powerful sentiment we are accustomed to call loyalty to and reverence for a personal sovereign; the chief, the essential element of whose sovereignty is power and right to command, as against all individual subjects and associations of subjects.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE SUPERNATURAL MONARCH.

IT has been greatly to the disadvantage of kings that they are, despite their greatness, human beings and mortal. However superior they may be, the limitation of both their power and their perfection cannot be ignored. Sometimes it is painfully obvious. Canute could not stay the sea, nor Cæsar avoid the dagger of Brutus. Monarchs are not proof against disease nor against the countervailing of men. Nor are they heroes to their valets. Under many circumstances they are in such a position as to excite contempt and even ridicule for their weakness. Frequently their acts are such as to inspire malignant hatred. In either of these conditions the sentiment of loyalty is undermined, and only favorable opportunity is needed to cause the breaking forth of rebellion. It is considered that prosperous treason is no longer treason, and sacred as may be the majesty of the king, when his power is gone his glory has departed.

These things being so, it is not strange that monarchy has generally called religion to its support.



The religious sentiment of loyalty to God is of the same nature as the political one of loyalty to a king. Both recognize a sovereignty and the duty of obedience. Both set up models of superior power and superior excellence. Both have their roots in fear, and both afford room for love and trust. In fine, the attributes ascribed to the supernatural monarch are but enlargements and extensions of the traits assigned to the human ruler. But the divine ruler has the great advantage of being an ideal creation, assumed to be absolutely perfect in all his attributes, with no possible risk of his dignity being lowered by actual comparison of reality with the ideal standard. God is not the subject of criticism by courtiers; and though from his remoteness he may not be able to exercise the direct, present, and constant influence of an earthly governor, as a sovereign of infinite perfections he stands immeasurably superior.

Loyalty to a divine monarch is inculcated by religion. From the fallibility of human rulers, it naturally happens that sometimes obedience to the latter conflicts with obedience to the former. The greater the purity and ideality of the divine law, as interpreted by the ministers of God, the more contemptible appear the requirements of a weak or vicious monarch. Hence, in order to sustain the authority of the latter, it becomes neces-

sary to hedge the king about with divinity. He himself must become a priest of heaven. He must stand as the representative of the Greater King. He must hold the sceptre as God's vicerent upon earth. He rules by the grace of God, whose servant he is and upon whom God's favor especially rests.

Thus the threatened opposition between divine and human authority is averted. Of course historically this is not always so, as innumerable conflicts between state and church testify. And many are the instances where the sense of duty of an individual to God has impelled him to resist defensively, or overtly and aggressively to attack, royal power. But, on the whole, religion has been a bulwark of monarchy. The idea that he is God's representative in the civil and political order operates largely to prevent the people from considering the king's shortcomings. His sins are all venial. He can do no wrong. Gluttony, lechery, cruelty, avarice, do not appertain to a king. Private vices are immaterial, and public crimes are the work of bad advisers or subordinates. In like manner, on the other hand, all his virtues are exaggerated. He is most magnificent, most beneficent, most noble, most Christian. He is clothed with divine traits of character, and frequently is sainted or made a demi-god. With the

aid of these religious increments the sentiment of loyalty to a monarch becomes strong enough to persist even though the ruler be worthless or wicked, entirely unfit for his exalted station.

In recent times the private character of royal personages has greatly improved. For the most part they have been amiable, kind, generous, fairly intelligent, personally attractive when young, and dignified, respectable, and lovable when the afternoon of life is reached. The Emperor William I., of Germany, was undoubtedly a magnificent specimen of humanity, whether considered physically, mentally, or morally. Queen Victoria is ordinarily exalted as a model of womanhood. Most of the reigning sovereigns of civilized nations are thoroughly respectable, impressed with the sense of their responsibilities, and animated by a Christian sense of duty to their fellow-men. Under such circumstances the monarchical *régime* appears at its best. When loyalty to the divine and the human king, to the supernatural and the political monarch, can be blended and concentrated upon a person who, being a man, exemplifies the most divine traits of humanity, the advantages of this form of civil government for the stability of society and the happiness of mankind are the most salient and the most real.

## CHAPTER III.

### DEMOCRACY.

IT will not be necessary for the purposes of this work to trace the course of historical evolution by which, through the increasing desire and demand for individual liberty and political equality, democracy came into vogue. Nor is it important to repeat the familiar arguments by which the superiority of a democratic form of government is thought to be demonstrated. It is, however, within our line of study to note some of the imperfections of popular rule and how they came to arise. To do this effectively we shall be obliged to inquire into the influence upon character of the greater power in political matters which democracy confers on the individual. Character determines conduct in large measure, and the determining sentiments which make up character are different under different *régimes*.

Whatever results may be worked out in practice, theoretically, at least, democracy does not contemplate doing away with law or government. It claims only to present a superior form of government and a better method of applying and enforce-

ing law. It does not aim to detract from the sacredness of law or lessen the duty of obedience, although it may regard the sources as different and create different rules of interpretation.

The principle of social existence under any theory can only allow to the individual so much liberty as consists with the common liberty. And, indeed, without social liberty it can readily be shown that individual liberty cannot be secured. To assure the common freedom there must be law, which must be obeyed and enforced. This is recognized under a democratic as under any other government.

But with popular sovereignty the seat of authority is changed. The sovereign is not one but the many. There is no person or class of persons in whom remains inherent the right to rule, but every man is entitled to say, "I am king," as much as any other. Every one lawfully may command as he is by law required to obey. Each individual may participate in the making of law, in its interpretation, and in its enforcement. He is free to form his own ideas of right and wrong, of what ought to be allowed and prohibited by the state; and also to put forth his best efforts to attain a position from which he may have power to exercise his will in accordance with his notions. He is permitted to "rise in the world," politically and

socially, and to aspire to any station that any other man may reach.

Thus it must inevitably happen that reverence for personality as the embodiment of righteous authority will abate. ] For whoever represents the law as its administrator does so only upon the election of the multitude—a plurality of the people. No particular sacredness is attached to him or his personal character. It may be accidental that he is invested with authority. He may be wholly unfitted, the worst of those who were candidates for the position. If despised personally, he is only entitled to consideration because, so long as he is in office, he is a minister of the law. And the fact that his tenure is short does not increase personal respect. With the spirit of competition becoming intense, in the general eagerness that he shall as speedily as possible get out of the way, disparagement, abuse, and obloquy are his unhappy fortune.

Thus, in a democracy the sentiment of loyalty to a person as invested with any portion of the sovereignty of the state tends to disappear. It is in a measure replaced, however, by love of country and patriotic impulses which keep alive the sense of duty to the state. In that strong reaction from monarchical institutions out of which democracy becomes established, liberty is the

great war-cry, and patriotic sentiment is focussed around the idea of greater freedom for the individual.

“My country, 'tis of thee,  
Sweet land of Liberty—  
Of thee I sing.”



If, then, a common interest of self-preservation exists, a degree of enthusiasm and energy may be created, through the dominance of an abstract idea, as potent and all-controlling as any sentiment of loyalty to a monarch. The superior force of tyrants in the world's history often has been wholly unable to overcome the unquenchable spirit of devotion to the cause of liberty. When, oppressed by evil conditions, people entertain strong hopes of throwing off the burden that weighs them down, there is a powerful motive force to effort. And if in the process of such achievement they are obliged to fight for life itself, the enthusiasm for country, for home, for altars and for fires, for native land, bursts forth into an energy of action which death can hardly paralyze, but which lives on and glows with greater intensity in those who survive, impelling them to immortal deeds of heroism.

Moreover, the personal element which is so important for the maintenance of the sentiment of loyalty, and which, at first thought, would seem

to be eliminated in the transition from monarchy to democracy, is still preserved, for a time at any rate and in considerable measure, by religion. There is no longer a king, indeed, who shines with the divine glory clothing him, but if there exist faith in a supernatural ruler, such a theory of ethics is apt to be embraced as will make love of and service to one's country, to the cause of liberty, the development and improvement of the human race, service to God and proof of loyalty to him. The voice of the people becomes the voice of God, and in heeding and following the one we respect and obey the other. Such a coincidence of patriotism and religious devotion is found in its most effective form in the New England commonwealths at the time of the American Revolution. The government became essentially theocratic. As Mr. Oscar S. Straus\* has shown, "In the spirit and essence of our constitution the influence of the Hebrew commonwealth was paramount." "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." "But where, say some, is the king of America? I'll tell you, friend; he reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind like the royal brute of Britain. Yet, that we may not appear to be defective even in earthly honors, let a day be set

---

\* "Origin of Republican Form of Government in the U. S." (1885), p. 79, and elsewhere.



apart for proclaiming the charter; let it be brought forth, placed on the divine law, the word of God."\* In those days the influence of the ministers and preachers was exceedingly great in their application to politics of the teachings, and the enforcement of the commands, of Holy Scripture. To be patriotic and to be religious were the same. In loyalty to God was both the source and the constantly feeding spring of patriotic thought, desire, and action.

The American democratic republic was avowedly established to secure certain "inalienable rights" with which men "created equal" are "endowed by their Creator"; "among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."† That is to say, the founders of this republic intended and expected to attain for all the people security to pursue happiness unhampered and unhindered, to follow out such ends and aims of life as they might choose and entertain. This involves, of course, the limitation placed upon each individual by the equal rights of others; but, subject to this restraint, it was designed to open the way to each person to follow the bent of his nature in working out his own happiness and accomplishing his own destiny. These purposes

---

\* Quoted from Thos. Paine: "Common Sense," *op. cit.*, p. 186.

† Declaration of Independence, 1776.

have been realized to a degree never before known in the history of the world. Undoubtedly there has been attained in America a more complete security than ever before reached for the free development of the spontaneous energies of the individual man.

It is quite obvious that the ends which the free and autonomic citizen will pursue will be somewhat different from those set before the subject in a monarchical *régime*. All those employments and objects of aspiration which are appurtenant to the pomp of kings and royal aristocracies are swept away. The courtier's honors are abolished. This of itself works considerable change, but, after all, it is relatively a small matter compared with the vast alteration in the whole scheme of social life. The contrast cannot be better shown than by the terms Militant and Industrial Civilization. These are by no means synonymous or coincident with Monarchy and Democracy, respectively; for there have been militant democracies, and there have been and are industrial monarchies. But it is undeniably the case that the establishment of democracy tends to bring about a social state wherein the arts of peace and the commercial industries are universally cultivated and flourish to a prevailing extent. That such should be the case is inevitable, for success in war necessitates

a monarchical order and the adoption of the methods of absolutism. By the very theory of a democratic society, soldiery as a career loses most of its interest. It may be honorable to serve in a militia for defensive purposes, but chieftainship, which is essential to a purely military ambition, is impossible. Where all are equal before the law, no one can attain such a supremacy as to say, "I will lead you to conquest and glory." The will of no one can be powerful enough to induce the many to enter upon war, unless first the democratic *régime* is broken down. And if from peculiar circumstances it happen that a popular movement brings about war, such uprisings are so uncertain and occur so seldom that the youth beginning life naturally seeks his career rather in the activities of peace, and makes her rewards his chief object of effort.

If the state of society be such that life is secure from violence, its support by industrial activity will be the first consideration. Freedom to accomplish this will become the chief constituent in the idea of liberty. But the support of life speedily becomes a matter not merely of activity, but of preserving the products of activity. Not only work is needed, but laying up a store as the result of work against the day when labor is no longer possible. Hence, obtaining and holding

property rises to the position of a prime object of life in an industrial community. It is directly conducive to the preservation of existence, and without it, to say the least, life is precarious and insecure. Freedom to acquire and hold property in security thus comes to be of essential importance under a democratic *régime*, because this is necessary to that development of life, in the liberty to choose and pursue individual aims, which is the fundamental idea of democracy.

But this is not all. The desire for liberty is also the desire for expansion. An oppression which is crushing out life stimulates opposing energy to throw off the burden. When this is lifted, the principle of growth continues to operate in enlarging the field of action. The impulse to overcome resistance is still strong, although the necessity for self-preservation has passed. That is to say, craving for liberty very speedily grows into an eagerness for power, leading to the formation of ideals of success, reputation, honor, greatness, which are set up and followed with great persistence. But power in an industrial democratic civilization can best be obtained through the possession of wealth. He who already has that which all men are seeking, is in a position of vantage. By the use of his money he can command the services of those who are struggling for support or

for an improved status. They will do his bidding according to the degree of their necessities or ambitions. He can hire service directly, or obtain it indirectly through the natural inclination people have to attach themselves to the prosperous and great. He can enjoy luxuries and make others sharers with him. He can satisfy his desire for achievement of great things by planning and carrying out vast enterprises adding to his resources and augmenting his fame. He can more readily secure political eminence and the honors of official station. Whatever may be his tastes, he can gratify them most completely by acquiring riches, which bring both security and power. To do this becomes the individual's chief aim, and to accomplish the desired result he bends all his energies.

The community, consequently, comes to present the spectacle of extended and intense industrial and commercial competition, in which every man's hand is turned against his neighbor to gain what advantage he can within the field of strife. A constant warfare goes on which occupies the energies, sharpens the wits, and concentrates the attention upon the exigencies of business success. The active side of human nature is everywhere stimulated, while the enjoyments of rest and leisure are little considered. Constant exertion is the rule; nobody is satisfied with what he has

attained, but is forever striving for something more.

Generalizing the results of this condition of affairs upon character, it will readily be seen that the tendency is to increase selfishness and self-concentration, and to diminish and dwarf the self-denying virtues. The individual self becomes to each one the centre of all aims. No doubt in monarchical countries the same spirit is observable, but duties of self-abnegation are required which keep the character balanced. With these last removed, as to a great extent they are in a democracy, the individual's advantage becomes more completely the standard of his conduct. He no longer asks, What do I owe to the community in this matter? but rather, What will be the use to me of this or that particular course? And the more stable the order of society, the more certain is this to be the case. When a person feels perfectly secure of his life, liberty, and property, it does not occur to him that he is bound to make any sacrifices for the general good. The welfare of the country does not occupy his attention, except in a very general way. It is hard to persuade him that he has active duties to perform as a citizen. The need of his exertions in that line is never pressed upon him. The more successful democracy is, the more prevalent is that

separatism which weakens the claims of social duty and makes the individual man the end and measure of all things to himself. Whatever career he enters into, the chief consideration is what can be got out of it for one's self, not what service can be rendered to others. The present gain is eagerly grasped ; the more remote and larger advantage is set aside.

Under the circumstances described, not only do the general aims and objects of life become more self-limited and egoistic in their nature, but the methods of attaining those ends are affected by the condition of enlarged freedom. The individual claims the prerogative of being the sole judge of the right and wrong of his own actions. His own opinion of his conduct is as good as that of any other man. His acts and opinions of them being colored by his interests, it naturally follows that his sense of justice to others is weakened. Business is war, and he lays down as a rule of action, "Do others, or they will do you." Hence the sense of honor is blunted, and honesty itself ceases to be held in high regard. As in a militant and monarchical civilization murder is the prevailing crime, so in an industrial and democratic society, cheating, fraud, and stealing are the prominent and pervasive derelictions. Under the militant *régime* war means assaults upon life ; in

an industrial society, though so-called peace prevail, war exists in the form of contests for property, often of the most intense and merciless ferocity. In its effects upon character it may well be doubted if the latter is any improvement over the former. With all its horrors, military life develops grand and heroic characters, while industrial war tends to create sneaks and poltroons. Besides, the war of the sword is intermittent. The battle over, humanity, courtesy, the finer and gentler feelings come into full play. In the industrial conflict the battle never ends. The combatants always have on their armor. Unless one is ever on guard, the death-dealing stab may come at any time. War is even carried into social life; the entire being is so moulded as to be fitted for and everywhere to exhibit the condition of struggle.



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE DEGRADATION OF LAW.

IN the preceding chapter we saw how the sentiment of obedience to authority surely becomes weakened when it ceases to have a kingly personage upon whom to rest ; but that a struggle against oppression or aggression develops the sentiments of patriotism which are just as effective, and that the alliance of the sense of moral and political duty with the religious emotions and motives preserves a loyal devotion to the state and the welfare of the community in general. But we also observed that as the social order becomes more assured in a democracy, and there is little danger apprehended of any assault upon the institutions of government and society, the patriotic sentiments likewise become diminished in force, the aims of activity become self-centred and indifferent to the general good. If now the hold of religion upon the mind and heart is loosed, so that loyalty and duty to a divine monarch no longer influence conduct, what have we left of authority to constrain the wills of men to respect right and justice ?

There is a remarkable warning uttered by De

Tocqueville which is quite apropos of this question. It is to the effect that the passion for material well-being has no check in a democratic community except religion, and if religion were to decline, then liberty would perish. Mr. John Rae remarks upon this: "It is impossible, therefore, in an age when the democratic spirit has grown so strong and victorious, to avoid taking some reasonable concern for the future of liberty, more especially as at the same time the sphere and power of government are being everywhere continually extended, and what is called material civilization is ever increasing, and religious faith, particularly among the educated and the working classes, is on the decline." \*

That such a decline of religious faith has occurred in America there can be no doubt. The deference paid to the teaching of the Scriptures in the colonies at the time of the Revolution, as exhibited in the work of Mr. Straus quoted from in the last chapter, no longer exists, nor does there prevail the fear of God as a bestower of rewards and punishments in this world to a degree sufficient to affect conduct to any great extent. The situation

---

\* See "Contemporary Socialism," by John Rae, Introduction, p. 26, where the author comments upon De Tocqueville. I have alluded to this in another work, "The Problem of Evil," chap. xxvii. p. 266.

so much deprecated by the French commentator on our institutions has arrived; what result is noticeable?

In general terms, we may say the result is to destroy or impair the sentiment of reverence for law, and of duty to honor and sustain it. Law no longer has its seat in the bosom of God, but is a human institution. Nor, as such, is it venerable as a permanent and certain rule to be respected and obeyed universally by all good citizens. It is regarded as a temporary, shifting, accidental restraint upon conduct, which has no inherent sacredness and which is liable to be set aside or modified as public opinion shifts. It is not an infallible expression of justice, but, on the contrary, often works injustice. It is not a thing to be perpetuated, but rather to be abrogated as soon as circumstances allow.

It would not be a matter of so much concern if this view only led to efforts to change and improve law in orderly methods. But there are other and very dangerous consequences. Such a want of respect is developed that the duty to obey law until it is changed is no longer felt. The moment the individual interest comes into collision with the legal mandate, the latter is regarded as an obstruction to be gotten rid of in one way or another. Ingenuity is then set at

work to discover some way in which the law can be nullified or avoided. No conscience interferes to prevent this. On the contrary, it is considered a mark of laudable ability, if such a design can be successfully accomplished. Reputable men inquire how they can circumvent the statutes, and thieves consult lawyers before they begin to steal, to ascertain the farthest limit to which they can go and escape the penitentiary.

Thus, with the individual's will as the arbiter and measure of all things for himself and his own conduct, sitting in judgment upon the acts of the community in its collective capacity, rejecting what he likes and supporting only if his interest dictates, the citizen ceases to feel any civic obligation, and all law comes to be regarded as more or less of an evil if it interferes with any settled aim or cherished purpose. Government is necessary—but for other people. The idea of applying to one's self the same rule of action which one would apply to the rest of the world fades away. Law becomes, then, a fact to be reckoned with, indeed; but to be dealt with, if occasion arises, simply as a business difficulty to be overcome by business skill. Verily, in this generation the commandment is no longer a lamp, nor is the law light, nor the reproofs of instruction the way of life.\*

---

\* Proverbs of Solomon, chap. vi. 23.

## CHAPTER V.

### COMBINATION AND ORGANIZATION.

UNDER conditions where activity is least fettered and freedom the most complete, it would seem that people ought to be satisfied. But it must never be forgotten that larger liberty generates wider ambition. And when the desire is aroused to realize such ambition, the impotence of the unaided efforts of one individual frequently becomes apparent. Then are developed the spirit of organization and movements toward combination. This is certainly advantageous as supplying a wholesome and potent counteractive to a threatened disintegration of society, which must appear when every man is for himself and the respect for authority is greatly weakened. But a man cannot have his own freedom without according to others equality of liberty. Further than this, when he forms his ends of life and tries to work them out, he is not able to accomplish much without the coöperation of others. And as, in a democracy, he cannot compel this assistance, he must invite it. He must accord something to the needs and wishes of his fellows. This

situation his intelligence quickly grasps. He sees that his road to the achievement of great results lies in combinations of and with other workers, and in voluntary organization for the purposes held in view. Without this he can do nothing; with it, everything.

The growth of the industrial and commercial spirit, leading men to follow the arts of peace rather than those of war, impelling them to build and construct rather than to destroy, insures co-operation chiefly in the direction of acquiring power by the accumulation of wealth. The promotion and management of business enterprises in all their variety present the great field for combination of efforts. To make such efforts effective there must be security of person and property; so that, however intense the struggle for success, the peace must be preserved and crimes of violence repressed. But beyond this there is very little restraint upon action. To secure the desired end foul means as well as fair are often employed. The more power attained through coöperation, the more unscrupulous the use of it. The more closely united and efficient the combination, the less will it regard obstacles arising from the obligations of social morality. So true is this, that in regard to the most far-reaching and tremendous form of combination a proverb has

been adopted which declares that "corporations have no souls."

The desire for political success and power is by no means absent in a democratic state. It exists often with the purpose of finding a career in politics itself. In former times in the American republic, and in some places at the present, the pursuit of politics as a principal life activity has been adopted and continued, so that men have distinguished themselves as statesmen and are characterized and remembered by their public work. Such men may have been popular leaders in political movements, occupants of important public offices, or advocates of measures of reform which, even if unsuccessful, brought their champions before the world as powerful characters. In whatever manner their energies may have been put forth, they are known as public men, whose rewards lie in the reputation they may have been able to achieve for ability and effectiveness in statecraft and service to the state.

But there are many others who see in political influence and power the way to obtain something they value more. They seek to use political position to acquire wealth, which they deem to be the most precious possession. Some desire office for a salaried living; others for the opportunities it affords them to make money indirectly by engag-

ing in large and lucrative undertakings, in furtherance of which official favor can be obtained or legislation influenced. Politics is a means to an end, and that end a private interest. The pervasive spirit of commercial and industrial aggrandizement seizes hold of the governmental system and utilizes it for business objects.

Whatever may be the ideas of people who enter into politics, and whether their motives be selfish or unselfish, if they expect to accomplish their designs they will not fail to recognize the necessity of this same method of combination and organization which we have observed as so essential in other spheres than the political. Especially is this indispensable where universal suffrage lies at the foundation of political power. One vote avails nothing, but a majority, directed to some given end, secures it and achieves the desired result. Wherever concentration is practicable, the stake is won. The larger the number of those who can be induced to join the combination, and the more thorough and complete the organization of those who have joined, so that as little force is wasted as possible, the more certain is the outcome of whatever effort is attempted. Here, as in everything else, in union there is strength.

Hence, there have come into existence in America two forms of combined action for political



purposes, which, though more or less involved with each other, can yet be broadly distinguished and are in many essential respects different. These we will consider in order in the succeeding chapters. The one I shall venture to term Government by Political Party; the other, Government by Syndicate.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE POLITICAL PARTY.

POLITICAL parties in the United States are for the most part national. Now and then local issues will develop local parties contained within State lines, but generally the field of their operations is wider. To maintain a national party, some ideas or principles seem requisite, and those parties have always maintained the most vitality which have had some definite object to be gained or policy to be pursued. The pro-slavery and the anti-slavery organizations are, perhaps, the most perfect specimens of partisan combination for a purpose. With them, the end to be attained was always kept in prominence. Intense feelings were aroused, and the most effective work was done because of a complete unity of sentiment. The individual was willing to sink himself for the sake of the cause, and the triumph of that cause was the thing sincerely desired above all else.

The capacity of the political party to evoke enthusiasm and command loyalty to itself has its good and its bad side. It no doubt increases the social spirit which binds men together by com-

mon ties of feeling and interest, and in considerable measure fosters patriotism. The theory of party is, of course, the securing, through its supremacy, of all the advantages to obtain which government exists. It is in furtherance of a good social and political order. It takes into account the welfare of large numbers of people. It aims for the general, not primarily for the individual, interest. It claims to be a servant of the nation, through whose success there will be greater prosperity for everybody.

On the other hand, the same enthusiasm and steadfastness, which are of so much value in a partisan, create one of the greatest evils of government by party. The sodality of the organization hinders and may defeat its legitimate ends. The loyalty to party transcends loyalty to the country. In the majority of human beings there is natural an adhesiveness to their surroundings, their associations, their friends, which is very difficult to overcome. In general, this is a creditable trait of character. It tends to promote stability, to favor a regard for man as man, to cause one to overlook faults and pardon transgressions. It is very much the same sort of sentiment as that which keeps the family together. But if sound judgment is not introduced to govern feeling, if a blind obstinacy causes one to deny pal-

pable faults and to impute virtues where none exist, it is unfortunate for everybody. Especially must this be the case where a prejudiced devotion to so large a combination as a political party prevents a calm and reasonable criticism of its efficiency and value for the country's weal. Yet whole communities are affected in that way. The uniform and almost unanimous adhesion of the Southern States to the Democratic party is an illustration, as also is the almost unvarying Republicanism of the States of Vermont and Pennsylvania, though the gravest scandals have attached themselves to the party management in the latter State. Where such a persistent adherence to party exists, it does not matter much how venal, corrupt, and unpatriotic the organization may be, the mind of the citizen seems incapable of breaking away and relinquishing the long allegiance. Even if the errors and misfeasances be recognized, the voter comes back to the old standard when the test of the ballot is applied, perhaps scarcely knowing, himself, why he continues to indorse an organization he sees to be in the wrong.

Bishop Phillips Brooks observed in one of his discourses: "This is the largest and richest education of a human nature—not an instruction, not a commandment, but a friend." The author of this sentiment might have qualified it by some

discrimination as to the kinds of friends, but no doubt the personal influence upon each other of those dwelling together in the same community counts for more than "instruction" or "commandment" imparted by any other agency. If fealty to the party is an extension of the family, the neighborly spirit, it is no wonder that men are supported for office because they are liked, not because they can pass a good civil-service examination; and that, when the party succeeds, the demand arises that the spoils of office shall be distributed among the victors. But it is not under circumstances of social kinship and fidelity that the greatest difficulty arises from the spirit of clannishness. Where this is strong, conservatism is pervasive. Loyalty to the party is genuine loyalty, which takes into account the character and reputation of the whole body. Men feel they owe a duty to their party, whose excellence is, indeed, cherished as an ideal. They must so act, if intrusted with official responsibility, as to bring credit and honor to those whom they represent. The latter feel responsible for their representatives, and require a good stewardship. So long, then, as the true theory of party as a means to governmental ends is preserved, it will continue to be true that he serves his party best who serves his country best.

Such preservation is greatly helped by the opposition of parties. All students of politics have remarked the great advantage to the public weal of a vigorous and effective opposition of at least two parties to hold each other in check. The shortcomings of one are relentlessly exposed by the other, its policies are thoroughly criticised, and its evil tendencies made a matter of publicity. If by argument and by conduct it cannot show the baselessness of the charges made against it, loss of public favor and defeat will follow. The necessity of thus being on the alert has a very powerful educating influence to keep the standards high. It is the party rioting in the luxury of power and not in fear of competitors, that is filled with corruption and dangerous to the welfare of the community.

Unfortunately, however, that same determination to seek present individual interest, which we have already commented upon so considerably, obtains within the political party and with relation to its movements, just as it does in everything else, be it the counting-house or the church. The difficulty is not, after all, that the party is partisan, that the constitution suffers "between friends," that sodality and companionship drive out all the patriotism, but that within the organization the same forces are operating which are

conspicuous in the whole social life of the state. Each one is endeavoring to rule, not to serve. Ambitious men are everywhere trying to turn the power of unity to their own individual benefit. It is what the party will do for them that they are solicitous about, not what they can do for the party. Like the forces of nature, it is something to be used, to be worked for what it is worth. If they profess blind loyalty, they always keep one eye a little open for their own interest. Of self-sacrifice there is none. Self-assertion is everywhere paramount.

When, therefore, men to whom loyalty and duty are words which have ceased to have any practical import, gain control of political machinery, and among the masses of the organization there still prevails the old superstitious devotion to the party flag, we find the truly unfortunate and discouraging situation. The devotees still worship, though the god has departed from the image and a devil has come to dwell therein. They follow where their leaders indicate, though it be down a steep place into the sea. However fallacious the principles and demagogical the measures which are proposed, they are adopted and supported because they bear the orthodox stamp.

The wonder is that where each man has a voice and a vote, the activity of the members of the

party is not aroused to overthrow a bad set of rulers and purify the organization from within. It is often said that the reason lies in a degenerate apathy, which reveals a callousness to all civic obligations. Even if this be so, there is still pertinent inquiry into the cause of this apathy. The explanation will be found, I think, in the tendency to organize, of which we have spoken, and, going with it, the tendency to specialization of functions. Combined and concentrated power accomplishes much more than scattered force. Dissent scatters energy and hinders the attainment of important results. Moreover, in the competitive struggle everywhere going on, a man needs all his attention directed to whatever he has selected as the principal end of his efforts. Save within narrow lines, he cannot hope to do effective work. Hence, the inevitable tendency is to leave everything to other people of which one does not feel able to make a vocation and to which he does not feel disposed to give his full thought and best work. Hence, politics comes to be a profession, and the management of political affairs is not intrusted to the amateur, but passes into the hands of the professional.

And now appears that other form of governmental administration to which reference was made at the close of the last chapter. Precisely as laborers combine in trades unions, as capitalists



organize into corporations and again into trusts, so professional politicians increase their power and fortify themselves in their places by combinations into "rings" and syndicates for political purposes of all sorts. For the reasons before stated, it may well be doubted if they rise to a position of control because of the ignorance or wickedness of the voting population. Their advent is a natural consequence of social conditions such as have been described in these pages. This is the first fact which reformers should consider. Due consideration will save them from wasting their breath in denunciations of human depravity, with the only result of lessening their own reputations as political seers and prophets. Jeremiads do not appear to have done much good in the days of Jeremiah. At present they signify less and are still less effectual. The better way is to see things that are *as* they are, then to ask in a scientific spirit *why* they are; after which it can better be determined whether they ought to be changed, and, if so, by what methods of action.

## CHAPTER VII.

### GOVERNMENT BY SYNDICATE.

MR. FRANK R. STOCKTON has written a very amusing story entitled "The Great War Syndicate," according to which, on the breaking out of a war between the United States and Great Britain, a syndicate of capitalists is employed, who, having become possessed of some truly marvellous inventions, by their instrumentality conduct the war speedily to a triumphant conclusion for the United States. If the present state of public opinion becomes more confirmed, it would not be so very surprising if, in case of conflict with a foreign power, the contract for carrying it on were actually let to a corporation, a syndicate, or a trust. For the business of government in general has in many instances been farmed out in a time of peace, and if this proceeding is satisfactory then, why should it be any less so in times of war?

The most complete form of government by syndicate has appeared in cities, for a variety of reasons, which will be disclosed as we proceed. Obviously the field is a better one in a municipality for those who wish to undertake the business of

governing. There is more governing to be done, and it pays better. On the other side, with a heterogeneous population, and with everybody busy with his own affairs, there is a greater apparent need of some one who will make a specialty of administration of public affairs. Hence the formation of political "rings," the very idea of which often arouses righteous indignation. Reflection should teach us that though in regard to some of their doings such wrath may be proper, neither a "ring" nor a "boss" is always and inevitably a dangerous phenomenon.

The control of public affairs by a syndicate is a matter of permission by the voters, on an implied contract in effect something like the following: A number of men, thrown together in one way or another, and of a tolerable degree of congeniality and power of adaptation, say to the people of the city, "We will undertake to govern this municipality, filling the offices with such men as we choose, giving you the service that such a town as ours requires for the security and comfort of its citizens, for such compensation as we can get you to allow us." In the minds of the proposers it is a commercial undertaking, very much like that of the contractor who essays to build and equip a railroad. They do it for the emoluments they expect to obtain. Whether or not they give a full

equivalent for what they get, depends both on the character of the men who do the work and on the closeness with which they are watched and held up to their duty.

Inasmuch as the syndicate is maintained in power by votes, and at public elections covering the whole political field, naturally it allies itself with some political party. Indeed, this would seem inevitable. For the syndicate is the outgrowth of combination and organization within the party; and even if it ceases to make party purposes its chief object, it can hardly divorce itself wholly from the wider association. Nor does its interest lie in so doing. For by alliance with the political party proper it has the advantage of being able to appeal with success to those minds which are influenced by partisan patriotic ideas. If the syndicate is Democratic, it can command the support of those who glory in the fact that they are Democrats; if it be Republican, in like manner those who always have been and always will be Republicans give it their votes. *In hoc signo* it wins its victories.

But the leading, the fundamental idea in this sort of combination is a private interest. Whether openly avowed or not, the animating spirit at bottom is a commercial one. The syndicate is a business combination for business ends. Those

ends are to make money by giving civil administration. To say that such a scheme, however, must necessarily be devoid of patriotism is not warrantable. Corrupt motives might as well be charged against every employee or every one who buys and sells. The employee works for his living, but sooner or later he finds out, if he succeeds, that good service is essential. The seller of goods sells for money, but the better the article the more he sells and the greater his profit. If government is a business worth doing, it is a business worth doing well. The "practical politician" finds this out as quickly as any one else, and trims his sails accordingly.

Quite apart from the educating influences of a criticising public to make those in office see that success lies in doing good work, it by no means follows that those who engage in government on the commercial principle have no regard for the common weal, no love of country, no respect for law and order, for honesty and decency in the relations of men to each other. On the contrary, they have the interest of all citizens in safety for themselves and security for their property. Their business will not otherwise prosper. The very commercial nature of their undertaking requires the preservation of peace and order as a *sine qua non*. All the traditions and sentiments which inspire

healthy appreciation of the blessings of a common liberty are present no less in the minds of the professional politician than in other people, even though the standard of action is lower and present expediency too frequently is preferred to the greater but more remote good. Under any form of government, the man whose political action, whether in office or not, is without taint of private interest, is exceedingly rare. And if the professional politician does not act upon lofty principles, he certainly is not an anarchist ; and perhaps, despite his dishonesties, it may be found that he has just as much love of country as the man who takes no interest in politics, and will not even trouble himself to vote.

To make the syndicate effective, there must be order and discipline among its members and followers. Orders given by those above must be obeyed by those below. It is not, and in its nature cannot be, a democratic organization, where each one has his say on equal terms with any other. If it be successful, it must become homogeneous. It must be closely knit together and compactly organized. It must have at least as much of a military *régime* as any large business establishment. The councils must take place at the top. Those in subordinate positions must be hands rather than heads. The more

numerous the members, the more necessity exists for solidarity. Every one must be relied upon to do the bidding of the heads of the house, else the association will be disrupted and the business will be a failure.

As a consequence of the need of perfection of organization, in the process of development of the syndicate the "boss" is very apt to make his appearance. He is usually a man raised to that eminence by merit, his merit consisting both in his knowledge of conditions and quickness in apprehending a change in them, and in his knowledge of and ability to control men. He attains his position not by formal election but generally by common consent. His tenure depends upon his success; that gone, influence with his own comrades goes with it, and some one else mounts his throne. He may be apparently absolute, or he may share his authority with two or three others, though the natural tendency is toward a one-man power, one general-in-chief, whose commands are law, at least upon critical occasions or in crucial matters. But however complete the absolutism may seem to be, more in politics than in any other kind of combination it will be found that the most successful leader is, after all, the best follower, who leads because he is quick to rise to the top of the wave that propels him forward.

Another characteristic of such combinations as we are now considering is seen in connection with the requirement of implicit obedience just spoken of. The subordinate workers are taught to feel that they are responsible first of all to the organization, and not to the people as a whole. The theory is that the syndicate, through its leaders, will deal with the voters, and that the duty of an office-holder put into office upon nomination of the society is to show complete fidelity to the association of which he is a member, executing its will and fulfilling its law first of all, even should this conflict with his own judgment of what is expedient for the syndicate or best for the welfare of the community. The discipline and effectiveness of the organization will be satisfied with nothing less than a military subordination to superior authority on the part of all who carry the colors of the army, in the rendering of which responsibility ends.

Of course there are various degrees of perfection of syndicate organization. Every party is governed more or less strictly by leaders, and often it happens that the influence of some one commanding personality is preëminent. Under other circumstances power is distributed, and the degree of allegiance required and given varies greatly. It is hard to make mere working tools



of men, yet the tendency is more and more to do so. Still, as a general rule, under the most exacting political "machines" it is not expected that all intelligence be abdicated, or that all political morality be thrown to the winds.

As to the advantages and disadvantages of government by syndicate, I shall have more to say in subsequent chapters. At present it is enough to note the very singular fact that the processes of social evolution have developed in a purely democratic country, where the right of all the people to participate in the government has always been most strenuously and jealously maintained, a form of civil administration wherein the many deliberately turn over to the few, voluntarily associated for the purpose, the tasks of governing, and refuse to be further concerned with civic affairs. This is done with no reluctance and no fear of loss of liberty, nor indeed with any apprehension that thereby government by the people for the people shall perish.

To statesmen of fifty years ago such a condition of things would be appalling. At the present time it is shocking to many, who nevertheless not only submit to but support the organization they condemn. In former days, no doubt, the establishment of a governing syndicate would mean revolution and loss of liberty. This is pre-

cisely what the same thing always did accomplish in the Italian republics. But a little thought will convince one that government by syndicate, as illustrated in the United States, does not in the slightest degree menace free institutions. The reason has been mentioned before in these pages. The social order throughout the country, and particularly in the municipalities (where this form of administration is chiefly found), is industrial and absolutely opposed to militancy. Any serious attempt to disturb the existing status by revolutionary methods would be thwarted at once. More than that, the very objects for which the syndicate exists, and in furtherance of which it waxes powerful, would be utterly defeated by the destruction of commercial prosperity. Any movement materially disturbing the social order would result in the disintegration of the organization itself. This would be the more certain the more completely it is devoted to money-making purposes.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES.

GENERAL principles do not take hold upon the mind effectually unless applied to particular cases. But if one is seeking to elucidate existing conditions and study political movements in the light of scientific principles, he walks on dangerous ground if he makes comparisons between political parties. The writer's sympathies and affiliations are sure to display themselves, and his work is apt to lose all scientific character in the eyes of a political opponent. Nevertheless, I shall venture to set forth what to my mind appear to be the chief motive forces influencing the policies of the two leading political parties in the United States, as distinguishing the one from the other. I mean more especially to indicate the underlying social sentiments, springing from character and determining individual desires and interests. If what I say is discredited on the score of partisan bias, I shall be sorry; but I see no way in which the purposes of this treatise can be accomplished without running the risk.

The Democratic party has existed almost from

the foundation of the United States, and has exhibited certain sentiments and ideas with a considerable degree of uniformity throughout its whole history. The Republican party began in the year 1854, having been founded to support the proposition that there should be no further extension of slavery in the Territories. It rose to power and maintained its supremacy upon an emergency, in devoting itself to the preservation of the Federal Union against the Slave States. For this emergency the Democratic party was found utterly wanting, its principles and policy carrying it to the extreme of permitting denationalization. The secession and slavery questions settled under the leadership of the Republicans, the Democratic party has been regaining its ascendancy upon the old lines, along which it had achieved such conspicuous success in the earlier days.

If I should attempt to characterize the Democratic party in the most general way possible consistent with accuracy, I should call it the party of Individual Liberty. This will answer both for an historical description and a statement of what it is at present. It believes in the right of each man to go to heaven or hell in his own way. It denies the right of society through government to interfere with matters of personal concern. It holds that government exists to furnish protection and

security against assaults upon the fundamental rights, so as to leave the individual truly free to seek happiness after his own methods, unhindered by his fellow-citizens. It claims that the government should go no farther than this, and that while it is the duty of the citizen to support the government, it is not the duty of the government to support the citizen. Hence, it insists that "the government should make the least possible demand upon the citizen, and the citizen the least possible demand upon the government. The citizen should never suppose that he can be made virtuous or kept virtuous by law, or that he ought to be helped to wealth or ease by those of his fellows who happen to hold the offices, and for that reason to be collectively called 'the government.' " \*

It readily appears that with such principles the Democratic party ought to be uncompromisingly democratic in the sense of believing in the full participation of the popular masses in the government. So it has been in the main. It has urged that the man of low estate should be heard as well as the mighty. The ignorant, the common, the toilers should be represented in office; their

---

\* Edward M. Shepard: "Man and the State," Brooklyn Ethical Asso. Lectures, p. 440. D. Appleton & Co. 1892.

wants should be considered and relieved according to their own ideas, not upon the principle of paternal kindness of superiors toward inferiors. The source of political power should be below, and the current from below upward, not contrariwise. The country should be governed not by the wealthy, not by the socially exalted, nor always by the aristocracy of intellect, but by the poor, the wage-earners, the strugglers, to whom political liberty is of the most importance, because from their necessities they are less free than those better circumstanced pecuniarily.

If the Democrat believes in the minimum of interference on the part of the government with the liberty of the individual, it is not strange to find him opposed to sumptuary laws. It is thus naturally the case that the Prohibitionist (as to sale of liquors) does not find himself at home in the Democratic camp. It is probably true that the liquor-selling interest generally supports that party, although in more than one Republican stronghold the rulers, recognizing the rum-seller's power in politics, do what they can to favor his traffic in return for fealty to their party. And in the State of New York the Democrats, controlling the legislature, have more than once refused to grant the demands of the liquor-dealers, deeming it bad policy to allow the latter to become inde-

pendent of the party control, and no longer obliged to pay tribute.

In pursuance of its theory of curtailing the scope of governmental functions and preventing the consolidation of power, the Democratic party has been the foe of centralization of government and the friend of home rule or local self-government. Sometimes, indeed, it has woefully failed to live up to its principles in this respect, but in general it has been faithful to them. It was this faithfulness which brought the party to its lowest depths of degradation at the time of the war of secession, preventing it from seeing that national unity must be preserved for the very sake of securing liberty and saving the blessings that had been gained under a *régime* of Democratic freedom. It was too theoretical and not practical enough. Some of its best men left the party, while the remnant blundered on and blundered ever, with incredible stupidity, to the great benefit and glory of their opponents. For a long period, as a national organization, it only fulfilled the offices of an opposition to the party in power, acting as a check or a drag, often in a very reprehensible spirit, and by deeds ill-timed, vexatious, and futile.

The Democratic party wages war on capitalistic monopolies, corporations, and trusts. Now that there has arrived a tyranny of wealth, it is inevit-

able that the Democracy should rise up against it. The party's traditions, its platforms, its composition, insure this. To be consistent it ought likewise to combat the corresponding tyranny of labor. But its course in this respect is not so clearly evident. The feeling no doubt prevails within the party, that the capitalist or monopolist is the aggressor, while laborers have combined only in self-defence. The despotism of labor combinations is a necessity of industrial war, which must be endured till the arrogance of capital is abated and a stop put to that thoughtless or wilful cruelty forever grinding the face of the poor. Be that as it may, it would be doing violence to all past and present Democratic orthodoxy if the party should fail to condemn, wherever it appears, the intolerable invasion of natural rights in which one workman, or a society of workingmen, undertakes to dictate to any individual whether or not he shall labor, and if he does so, on what terms and conditions.

The great mission of the Republican party finished, the query of those forecasting the future was, what characteristics would it have as a permanent factor in politics. As already stated, it sprang into being for an emergency. It was accidental, and was not born of permanent tendencies. It drew from existing parties, addressed itself to the task



before it, and achieved magnificent distinction. When its specific work was done, would it disband? If not, what course would it follow?

It did not disband, nor is it likely to do so, though now in the popular minority. Its patriotic career and the *éclat* of its successful conduct of the war naturally attracted to it the patriotic and duty-loving. It has often been said, and in many localities it was true, that it contained the greater part of the respectability of the population. It drew to itself at any rate the aristocracy. It has kept the aristocracy of wealth in large part, for reasons that will be mentioned presently. But beyond this it incorporated a great many of the old Federalist type, who did not dare to trust the people, but preferred to vest the governing powers in the higher classes, and consolidate them as much as possible in the Federal government. It is true that the Republicans demanded and secured negro suffrage, but that was against the conquered States and as hostages for their good behavior. The whole course of legislation during the reconstruction period was in the direction of centralization, which tendency was resisted by the Democrats, and finally aroused alarm in the Republican party itself, when the fear of militarism contributed not a little to defeat the nomination of President Grant for a third term.

It followed from the vast amount of constructive and reconstructive work to be accomplished under the leadership of the Republican majority, that its paternalism should become extended, and the party itself grow to be in a considerable degree socialistic instead of individualistic in its prevailing character. Those who think that men can be made moral by legislation, or that at least it is the duty of the state to try to make them so, find their political home in the Republican party. They have not been altogether satisfied there, as the rise of the Prohibitionists, for example, indicates; but, no doubt, of the two great organizations the Republican suits them better. Those who are anxious to have the government undertake works of philanthropy, beneficence, or missionary evangelization are in somewhat the same category. In fine, people who hold that the state should by its government seek not merely the negative security of the citizen but also his positive welfare, through positive acts of legislation, naturally belong to and contribute their part to give tone to the Republican party. ✓

The socialistic notion that the government should act to promote the interests of individuals or classes has developed a policy which marks the chief difference between the two most conspicuous political divisions to-day. A protective tariff for

the sake of protection as an economic measure, and a tariff for the exigencies of revenue only, are the leading propositions upon which the Republican and Democratic parties respectively stand before the country, and have constituted the most important issue on which two presidential campaigns have been fought out. Without here entering upon a discussion of these two policies, it is sufficient to observe that the attitude taken by the two parties on this question is quite consistent with the fundamental characteristics of each, and emphasizes the prominent traits of the one and the other.

The Democratic party, to sum up, is the advocate, in principle, of the greatest amount of individual freedom consistent with security to the rights of all to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. By this rule the office of government is to be limited, and no respect for its supposed sanctity is to permit it to transcend its proper limits. The party also is the opponent of aristocracy in any form, and a believer in the control of government by the masses of the common people. The Republican party upholds the policy of positive beneficence on the part of the government, not merely negative protection, and favors the extension of its activity to the promotion of industry by government assistance. It likewise is aristocratic in its

tendencies, and disposed toward the concentration of governmental functions in the hands of those more favored in wealth, education, and social prominence.

It has been said sometimes that the Democratic party is iconoclastic, and the Republican conservative. This is no doubt true, in a sense. Socialistic movements are constructive, and the party opposing them necessarily will be occupied largely with pulling down their edifices. But if the preservation of individual liberty, and of equality, be the aim, the iconoclasm may be like the destruction of unhealthy buildings upon a suburban water-shed, with the result that a whole city may thereby be saved from disease. Mr. Buckle has well remarked: "Every great reform which has been effected has consisted not in doing something new, but in undoing something old."

Although I believe the foregoing characterizations of the two great political parties in the United States are generally accurate, and display the woods, if not all the particular trees, it must not be supposed that, in either party, its avowed principles always control action, nor even that they are believed in by everybody. It often happens that, both at general elections, in legislative and in executive action, party doctrines and platforms are wholly ignored or disrespectfully tram-

pled under foot. The Democratic legislature of 1893 in New York devoted itself very largely to attempts at interference with the local government of cities, and in some of these attempts it was flagrantly successful. For aberrations and inconsistencies in both parties alike, two causes are prominently discernible: one, the politician's natural desire for the success of his party over its antagonist; and the other, that virus of private interest, to which reference has been made so frequently in the preceding pages. In the one case concessions are allowed to the ideas of special classes of doubtful voters, relying upon the faithful to support "the party, right or wrong." In the other instance, it may be a matter of balancing one private interest against another, or of selling out principle for private gain. Such things occur more frequently in local elections, in State legislation, and in what may be called private congressional legislation. But, despite all unfaithfulness and corruption, the two parties still represent principles to which they are tolerably constant. The interactions and interferences of public and private interests in the exercise of administrative functions can better be understood in the illustration of Government by Syndicate, to which we now proceed.

## CHAPTER IX.

### TAMMANY HALL.

TAMMANY HALL is the most perfectly constructed and the most effective for its purposes of the so-called "machine" local organizations in the United States. It is the most conspicuous example of syndicate government to be found in the country. It is the most ancient society of the kind. It is the most powerful and the most successful. It is a local organization which has been always affiliated with the Democratic party, though now and then rebelling against the regular candidates. For its independence it has sometimes been thrown out of State and national councils, but has always returned, been received, and even allowed to control the party.

Probably no political organization has been so widely and thoroughly abused, none more savagely assailed as possessing all the political vices, none so little defended by political philosophers. Nevertheless, it has thrived on condemnation. Movements against it have been time and again inaugurated with no success, and in 1890 the most formidable combination ever made against the

present *régime* of Tammany was effected, and, after a vigorous campaign of "education," was defeated at the polls by a plurality of 23,199 out of a total of 216,252 votes.\* Some excellent persons argue from this a complete and hopeless moral and civic degeneracy. It is always easy to charge social and political conditions upon sin and the devil; but this has generally been the special privilege of the clergy, and is an explanation surprising to find advanced by political thinkers. That the people are responsible to themselves for such a state of things, there is no manner of doubt. That for some years they have preferred, and still prefer, the government of Tammany Hall, is certainly evident. Such being the fact, the name of Tammany being so many times cited as typical of misrule must needs excite wonder. Is it possible that the inhabitants of the greatest city in America are of the mind of that man in the barber's shop, who, on being told he needed shampooing, as his head was very dirty, briskly replied, "I like it so"? The patent contradiction between the supremacy of Tammany Hall with the voters and the bad name attached to it very extensively throughout the country, demands a more careful examination of its meth-

---

\* Grant, Mayor (Tam.), 116,581; Scott (Combination), 93,382.



ods of action, its results, and its relations to the voters, than is usually accorded.

It is clear to the most superficial observer that Tammany Hall is not within itself democratically conducted. It is not ruled by the masses who vote its tickets, nor by a majority of them. Its power emanates from a central nucleus, and is projected outward and downward. It must, indeed, satisfy its followers to an extent sufficient to make them vote the ticket, but its methods of action are autocratic or aristocratic. Nevertheless, its sympathies are undeniably and unquestionably with the Democratic party and its principles. In character, in political ideas, in controlling sentiments, the members of Tammany Hall are thorough Democrats. Here, then, we find illustration of that anomaly referred to in Chapter VII., the remarkable case of an association of men of the most individualistic type, and favoring the most individualistic political principles, yet by the spirit of combination and organization consolidated into a hierarchy in which a half dozen persons have apparently almost absolute power. I say apparently, for, after all, the tenure of office of the leaders depends upon their competence and good behavior. Their action must necessarily be more or less constrained; but so long as they maintain their position their word is authoritative.



Counsel, indeed, they may take, but the votes that count are theirs.

The central nucleus, of which I have just spoken, consists of an Executive Committee upon which is placed the leader of the party in each Assembly District. There are now thirty of such districts in the city of New York, each entitled by law to send one member to the State Assembly, or lower house of the legislature. The Assembly District is, hence, the political unit for calculation, as the dollar is for currency. The district leader is the chairman of the General Committee of Tammany Hall in his district. This General Committee consists of an indefinite number of voters who constitute "the organization" in that district. The committee controls and regulates its own membership. Each district is, however, entitled only to a limited number of votes in the whole committee. The committee has its subordinate officers, and particularly its "Captains," one of each election district in the Assembly District, whose duties are to look after the interests of the regular candidates at elections, within their respective precincts. The total voting membership of the General Committee of Tammany Hall for all the districts is in 1893 about 3,500; the whole membership about 11,440.

The district leaders are not, as might at first be supposed, elected by their General Committees.

They are selected and removed by the central authority at its pleasure. They make their reports to the Executive Committee, and are responsible to it for the interests of Tammany Hall in their respective districts. The committees in those districts they substantially control. Each leader is an originator of business at the committee meetings, like a government minister in the House of Commons. The committee ratifies by vote what he proposes, and he exercises a veto power over other action of the committee, like the setting aside of a verdict by a judge. The wise leader, however, avoids the appearance of dictation and is not overbearing, relying rather on the sentiment of loyalty which prevails to enable him to carry through the measures he desires. Thus, the committee votes, but the chairman governs.

The Executive Committee in its turn is subjected to centralizing influences. By a process of common consenting its powers and authority become concentrated in a few men, who are not district leaders, but are made *ex officio* members of the committee on account of their prominence in the organization in general, occupying, as they generally do, the chairmanships of important committees. By still further consolidation that authority becomes practically vested in one man, who is acknowledged as the leader of the whole organi-

zation. While matters of importance are submitted to and voted upon by the Executive Committee, it generally happens that they are settled beforehand. The chief leader sends for and consults with as many members of the committee as he deems best, makes up his mind what is to be done, and passes the word, which is seldom disregarded. The whole spirit of the organization is one of waiting for orders and readiness to obey them. Whatever be the forms of deciding by suffrage, it is the few who determine what the decision shall be.

Of course this submission to the mandate of the leaders is voluntary. Nobody is obliged to belong to the organization. His rights will not be infringed nor his liberties be invaded if he is not a member of Tammany Hall, nor even if he be a decided opponent. And within the society there is nothing to prevent his opposing the powers that be. He does this at his own risk, however, and if not successful, will naturally lose favor. So long as Cæsar reigns, it cannot be expected that he will reward those plotting against his rule, or bring into prominence as a counsellor a man whose ideas he cannot adopt. But difference of opinion, and the expression of it, are common enough without any disfavor to anybody. Action, however, is crucial. In this, fidelity to

"the organization," as embodied in the decrees of the leaders, is required. It is the common sentiment of the association, that its workings shall be on the principle of leaving the general management to a few, or even to one person, the rest obeying orders and submitting gracefully to whatever is decreed. If, then, membership in Tammany Hall is a slavery, it is servitude of the same nature as that of volunteer soldiers who place themselves under a captain and obey his commands, believing that in this way the battle can best be won.

It is evident that leadership, in order to be maintained under such conditions, must be successful. Success means keeping the organization in official power. This can only be done by securing the requisite votes. The total vote in New York City in presidential election years has lately been as follows: 1892, 284,984; 1888, 269,204; 1884, 223,250. In 1890, which is the year in which a full combination of all factions was made against Tammany, we saw that the Tammany candidate, who was elected by 23,199 plurality, polled 116,581 votes out of 216,252. The total vote for governor in 1891 in New York City was 239,048. If the vote in 1890 be taken as an index of the voting strength of Tammany in a contest directed specifically against that organization, it will be

seen that in such case the society fails to secure a majority of the whole number of voters of the city. Of course no one can say how the absentees from the polls would have voted, but even if all voted the Tammany ticket (an almost impossible supposition), the fact that they did not vote is significant. And although in 1892, when the Democratic opposition to Tammany had collapsed (the whole attention being also concentrated upon the presidential election), Mr. Gilroy, the Tammany candidate for mayor, polled 173,510 out of a total of 284,984, the lesson of 1890 remains, which is, that the organization is not so secure but that wisdom and energy must be constantly employed to insure success. There are two chief ways in which this may be attained.

In the first place, the stanch and faithful adherence of the organization to the State and national Democratic party is of the utmost consequence. Among the voters in New York City are many thousands who are Democrats in sentiment, who always have been Democrats, as were their fathers before them, and who always will be Democrats. If, then, Tammany Hall, in national matters especially, is loyal to the Democratic party, it has a tremendous hold upon voters who, for the sake of its Democracy, will forgive it a multitude of municipal sins. In the presidential

campaign of 1892, in common with the rest of the regular organization of the party in the State, it found itself arrayed in most strenuous opposition to the will of the Democracy of the nation. It made its contest, was defeated, was forced to eat its own words, was humiliated and discredited. But, nevertheless, it accepted the situation, worked diligently and faithfully for the ticket, and on election day rolled up a magnificent vote for the national Democratic candidates. There is no doubt that Tammany Hall was greatly strengthened at home by this action, and gained an increased respect all over the country.

The second requisite to success lies in its chosen field. It must furnish a good municipal administration. As to what constitutes excellence, opinions will differ widely. Whether or not a respectable standard is reached, will always be a matter of antagonistic discussion. But at least its administration must be good enough to hold the voters to its support. Its leaders must either supply good government, or persuade the people that they are doing so. This they cannot do in the face of any very alarming derelictions. Whenever these have occurred, retribution has been swift and sure, as in the case of the Tweed ring.

Although it must be mentioned, it would go without saying that in order to preserve efficiency

the organization itself must be kept healthy. There are also two ways in which this may be accomplished. The first and most important is the judicious distribution of patronage, which is its bread and meat. But multitudinous as are the official positions and employments in a great city, the demand always exceeds the supply. The utmost tact in distribution must, therefore, be displayed. There are many keen eyes on the watch for irregularities and inequalities. With thirty district leaders, all of whom are besieged with applications for every kind of a position from a judgeship to that of crossing-sweeper, it is no easy task to apportion satisfactorily. If the followers are dissatisfied, the leader cannot control their votes. If the votes fall off conspicuously under his management, he is cashiered at headquarters. Under such circumstances it may well be supposed that love and harmony do not always reign in "the wigwam." But here the necessity of a strong central authority becomes very clearly apparent. If it were not for this, the rivalries of the districts would disintegrate the organization. But by the habit established of accepting the decisions of the chiefs without rebellion, the leader's position is improved in the eyes of his constituents, and the solidarity of the association preserved.

Another and very potent method of unifying



and amplifying the organization is on the social side. Collateral with the Tammany Hall political organization is the Tammany Society, which was established in 1789 for benevolent and social purposes. From this society is taken the quaint Indian nomenclature applied to Tammany dignitaries. It is from this society, too, that the chiefs of the political organization spring, and upon and around it the social auxiliaries are focussed. The social development of Tammany latterly has been very decidedly increased. Every district has its headquarters always open for social purposes. Most of the districts have club houses, some of which are exceedingly comfortable and elegant, with bowling alleys, billiards, card and smoking rooms, *cafés*, and all the usual accommodations, furnished at a very low rate of dues. Here the meetings of the General Committee are held, and every evening there is a greater or less attendance of members, who talk nothing if not politics.

In addition, there are many special social occasions in which the families of the voters take part. Dances, balls, picnics, excursions, outings of all sorts are frequently devised, and are almost invariably successful. That the social enthusiasm thus aroused is a valuable help in the way of strengthening the political power of Tammany Hall, cannot be doubted. In this connection it



may be stated that there is exercised no little amount of active benevolence in the different districts by officials and those who hope to be; who, though their motives may be selfish, are surely entitled to some credit for their practical philanthropy.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE SUPPORTERS OF TAMMANY HALL.

THE Tammany Society, organized in 1789, was established by William Mooney, an Irish-American, as a benevolent order of a fraternal character. The political organization, formed by the same set of people, and as collateral to the Tammany Society, was begun in 1800. In 1812 the political influence of the organization for that purpose became conspicuous. It was supported by local business men of good character and standing. In those days it appears to have concerned itself with the morals of the community, for in 1817 the society issued an address deploring the spread of the foreign game of billiards among the young men of the upper classes! The General Committee of Tammany Hall appeared in 1822, and consisted of thirty-three members. In 1836 the Committee numbered seventy-five. The present Assembly District organization did not occur till 1871. In 1834 Tammany became dominant in city politics, and has since continued so in the main, with occasional defeats, some of a severe character, as that by Mozart Hall in 1859. But

out of fifty years of mayors, Tammany has held the mayoralty thirty-two years.\*

Tammany has generally found its voting strength among what may be termed the lower middle class. Unquestionably it has always drawn the sympathies of the lower classes generally, rather than the upper—the masses of plain, common, poor people, whom, it is said, God must love because he made so many of them. Those who work with their hands for daily wages, if they are of the Democratic persuasion, are very likely to be Tammany men. In the earlier times there was a substantial alliance between the Hall and the business community. At a later date, “business men’s” and “citizens’” movements generally have been against Tammany. The liquor-dealers have for the most part been on the side of Tammany, on personal liberty, anti sumptuary law principles. No doubt their influence has carried with it the sympathy of those in the community who find their social life in the saloons. Since the city is overwhelmingly Democratic, and Tammany Hall the largest Democratic faction, and now the only one, it is easy to argue that all

---

\* These facts are taken from an article entitled “Tammany Hall,” by Talcott Williams, in “Lalor’s Cyclopedia of Political Knowledge,” and an “Historical Sketch of Tammany Hall,” by Hon. Nelson Smith (1892).

the liquor-drinkers, bummers, loafers, toughs, and actual or would-be criminals belong to Tammany, and control its policy. But no more of this class, relatively, are Tammany adherents than are Republicans. If we take any ward of the city in which the lowest classes of voters preponderate, we shall find that, in proportion to the total vote of the two parties with respect to each other, there are just as many Republican "toughs" as there are Tammany "toughs." Toughness *per se* does not make a person a Tammany man. Democratic ideas will make people Democrats; and if a man, being a Democrat, has toughness added unto him, it is not his toughness but his Democracy that makes him join Tammany; or it may be his hope to get more from the dominant party than from the other—but it is not alone toughs who are actuated by this motive. In short, Tammany Hall has relatively no more voters from the idle, semi-criminal, and criminal classes than come from the preponderance of the Democratic vote in the whole population, and the fact that Tammany is the only or the chief Democratic organization.

It never has been considered an objection to a man in the Tammany organization, that he happens to be an Irishman. One of the earlier objects of the association was to see that foreign-

born citizens were not ostracized from political office ; and this aroused a good deal of antipathy on the part of those who favored a "native-American " or " Know-Nothing " policy, of putting in office none but native-born citizens. The dislikes arising from this cause have not yet died out. But whatever the opposition, the sentiment of the organization has not changed, and Irish or Irish-Americans (in nativity) have generally formed the controlling power in Tammany Hall. Horne Tooke, I think it was, propounded an argument that "the being an Irishman" was the cause of republicanism in an individual, meaning by republicanism a democratic spirit. While we can scarcely ascribe to Irish immigrants the formation of American democracy, they certainly have done their share in managing it since it was established, sometimes for better, sometimes for worse, but always with energy and skill, displaying to a remarkable degree that knowledge of human nature so necessary to the practical politician. ✓

The German element in the Tammany host is by no means an inconsiderable one, and has latterly been increasing. It has a good representation in the councils of the organization, and its vote is intelligent and loyal. The Hebrews are well represented ; the French and Italians also.

Among all the foreign-born population or their immediate descendants, Tammany, has an influential share of voters.

It will greatly aid the reader to form an idea of the sources of the regular Tammany vote, which may be depended on in case of emergency, if we give a *résumé* of the different Assembly Districts, showing the character of their population, and the Tammany vote as compared with the total for mayor in the election of 1890, when the last combination of anti-Tammany forces was made, and attention especially directed to local issues.\*

FIRST ASSEMBLY DISTRICT.—Business portion of the city below Canal Street west of Broadway and below Spruce Street on the east. Immigrant hotels, poor tenements; many janitors and watchmen. Irish, Germans, Scandinavians, mingled with native Americans.

*Total vote*, 5,057; *Grant, Tammany*, 3,320; *Opposition*, † 1,737. All the election districts were carried for Grant.

SECOND DISTRICT.—South of Canal Street and east of Broadway, south of Catharine Street to Spruce. Tenements and factories, the former

---

\* For valuable assistance in preparing this *résumé* I am indebted to Hon. Charles G. Wilson, President of the Board of Health.

† Including scattering, blank, and defective ballots.

of a very poor quality; sailors' boarding-houses and cheap lodging-houses. Very poor people. Large Italian colony; many Chinese and Japanese; many Jews, particularly Polish; Irish and natives gradually diminishing.

*Total vote, 5,870; Grant, 4,528; Opposition, 1,342.* All the election districts were for Grant.

THIRD DISTRICT.—Between Broadway and the Bowery and Third Avenue, above Canal Street and below East Twenty-third Street. Business property and residence intermingled, the latter of poor quality in lower part and fair and good above Bleecker Street. Tenements and boarding-houses abound. In the lower part there are many Italians, rag-pickers and scavengers; in the middle portions Italians, Irish, Germans; in the upper streets, Irish and natives. This is a very mixed district, both as regards population and the character of the buildings.

*Total vote, 5,756; Grant, 3,577; Opposition, 2,179.* It is interesting to notice that in the election districts below Great Jones Street, Grant polled 2,276 votes, while his opponent, Scott, received 816; whereas in the districts above, Grant polled 1,301 to Scott's 1,279; while in the seven election districts north of Fourteenth Street, Grant's vote was only 673 to Scott's 1,041. Scott carried six election districts out of twenty-six.

FOURTH DISTRICT.—The East River front south of Division and Grand Streets and north of Catharine. Tenements and middle-class dwellings. Irish, Russian Jews, and natives.

*Total vote*, 8,029; *Grant*, 5,243; *Opposition*, 2,786. The vote ran very evenly through the different election districts. It may be assumed that this is the case except where special mention is made. Scott carried one election district out of thirty-seven.

FIFTH DISTRICT.—West side of Broadway between Canal on the south, Houston and Bleecker Streets on the north. Business property, tenements, and small dwellings. The "French quarter;" also many Italians and negroes; natives in the western part.

*Total vote*, 5,492; *Grant*, 3,317; *Opposition*, 2,175. In one election district only did Scott receive a plurality (127 to Grant's 124). This was the sixth, bounded by Hudson, Broome, Dominick, and Clark Streets.

SIXTH DISTRICT.—East of Norfolk Street, and between Rivington and Stanton on the north, and Grand and Jackson Streets on the south. Tenements and factories. Germans very largely, Jews and natives.

*Total vote*, 7,159; *Grant*, 3,885; *Opposition*, 3,274. Scott obtained a small plurality in six



election districts in the eastern portion of the Assembly District.

SEVENTH DISTRICT.—West of Broadway between Bleecker Street and West Twenty-third Street, extending to the west irregularly as far as Sixth Avenue (at the south end), West Fourth Street, Eighth Avenue, Sixteenth Street, and thence Seventh Avenue to Twenty-third Street. Below Fourteenth Street this includes business property, tenements, small residences, and many boarding-houses; below Washington Square, business blocks, cheap boarding-houses, a portion of the French quarter. Above Washington Square east of Sixth Avenue, and below Fourteenth Street, fine residences and business houses. Above Fourteenth Street the cross streets are fine residence streets and the avenues devoted to business. The inhabitants south of Washington Square are largely French, Italians, and negroes; north, natives and Irish; eastern portion, many wealthy citizens; western part, well-to-do people of middle class.

*Total vote*, 7,393; *Grant*, 3,119; *Opposition*, 4,274. In this district we find the situation reversed. Grant received a plurality in only eight out of thirty election districts. These were the first and second (south of Washington Square), in which the vote was, respectively, Scott, 100,

Grant, 104; Scott, 65, Grant, 127. Also the fourteenth, the triangle between Greenwich Avenue, West Eleventh and West Tenth Streets; Scott, 106, Grant, 129. Also the nineteenth, between Sixth and Seventh Avenues and Eleventh and Thirteenth Streets: Scott, 123, Grant, 125. Also the twenty-third (S., 85, G., 115) and twenty-fourth (S., 147, G., 166), between Fifth and Seventh Avenues and Fourteenth and Eighteenth Streets. Also two districts directly north of these last, one of them reaching to Twenty-third Street (twenty-seventh: Scott, 54, Grant, 107; twenty-eighth: Scott, 107, Grant, 149).

EIGHTH DISTRICT.—East of the Bowery as far as Norfolk Street, between Stanton and Division Streets. Large crowded tenements. Foreign population, very largely Hebrews, and some Germans.

*Total vote*, 6,257; *Grant*, 3,696; *Opposition*, 2,561. Scott received a plurality in no election district.

NINTH DISTRICT.—On the North River, from West Houston to West Sixteenth Street, extending on the east to the line of West Fourth Street. Formerly Greenwich Village. Small houses, tenements, and middle-class dwellings. Inhabitants include many old residents, some Irish, and Germans.

*Total vote*, 8,006; *Grant*, 4,312; *Opposition*,

3,694. Scott received a plurality in ten out of thirty-seven election districts.

TENTH DISTRICT.—East of the Bowery as far as Avenue B, between Stanton and Eighth Streets. Tenements, boarding-houses, and some private houses. A distinctively German neighborhood.

*Total vote*, 8,672; *Grant*, 4,400; *Opposition*, 4,272. Scott had a plurality in fourteen out of forty-five election districts; most of the remainder were close.

ELEVENTH DISTRICT.—Between Twenty-third and Fortieth Streets and Seventh and Lexington Avenues. A "brown-stone" district. Fine hotels, business blocks, theatres, and elegant private residences, homes of wealthy citizens. West of Sixth Avenue, however, poor tenements; many negroes and Irish.

*Total vote*, 5,313; *Grant*, 1,737; *Opposition*, 3,576. Grant received a plurality in no election district. His largest vote was 141 to Scott's 172 in the eleventh district, which is west of Sixth Avenue between Thirtieth and Thirty-second Streets. His smallest was 41 to Scott's 202 in the seventeenth district, which is west of Sixth Avenue between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth Streets.

TWELFTH DISTRICT.—Between Avenue B and

the East River, and between Stanton and East Eleventh Streets. Tenements, factories, gas-houses. Inhabitants mostly Germans; a few Bohemians, Hungarians, and Poles.

*Total vote*, 6,810; *Grant*, 3,042; *Opposition*, 3,768. Scott's vote was 3,381, and 278 were cast for August Delabar, Labor candidate. Scott received a plurality in twenty out of thirty-five election districts. Grant's strength was between Houston and Stanton Streets and between Avenues B and C, the southern and southwestern part of the district.

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT.—West of Seventh Avenue between Sixteenth and Twenty-sixth Streets. Stores, tenements, and largely private houses. Formerly Chelsea Village. Inhabitants old residents, natives and Irish. Along the river front, poorer class of population; east of that, well-to-do people.

*Total vote*, 8,231; *Grant*, 3,981; *Opposition*, 4,250. Scott carried fifteen election districts out of thirty-six. Grant carried districts lying along Sixteenth and Seventeenth Streets, three or four along Seventh Avenue, and five lying between Eighth and Tenth Avenues and north of Twenty-fourth Street. Grant also carried the twentieth district (128 to 120), which contains a large apartment house, "The Chelsea," inhabited by voters

of very superior intelligence and highly moral character.

FOURTEENTH DISTRICT.—East of Third Avenue to the East River, and between Eighth and Eleventh Streets on the south and Fourteenth on the north. Tenements, lodging-houses, boarding-houses, and some private houses. Inhabitants largely Germans, with Hungarians and natives.

*Total vote*, 5,862; *Grant*, 3,233; *Opposition*, 2,629. Scott received a plurality in only four out of twenty-eight election districts.

FIFTEENTH DISTRICT.—West of Seventh Avenue and between West Twenty-sixth and West Fortieth Streets. Tenements and private houses, with fat-rendering establishments, slaughter-houses, and factories along and near the North River. Many good residences, but also many very poor tenements. Inhabitants Irish and natives, also negroes.

*Total vote*, 9,211; *Grant*, 5,074; *Opposition*, 4,137. Scott carried eight out of forty-five election districts, all but one lying together between Seventh and Eighth Avenues between Thirty-second and Fortieth Streets.

SIXTEENTH DISTRICT.—East of Third Avenue to the East River, between Fourteenth and Twenty-sixth Streets. Tenements and private

houses, factories and gas-works. Germans and Irish largely; laboring class of people.

*Total vote*, 7,365; *Grant*, 4,391; *Opposition*, 2,974. Scott received a plurality in only two out of thirty-six election districts.

SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT.—West of Seventh Avenue and between Fortieth and Fifty-second Streets. Factories and rendering establishments along the river front; farther east, tenements and private residences; middle-class residence neighborhood. Many Irish and negroes; also native population.

*Total vote*, 11,246; *Grant*, 6,274; *Opposition*, 4,972. Scott had a plurality in ten out of fifty-one election districts.

EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT.—East of Lexington Avenue between Twenty-sixth and Forty-second Streets. Tenements and private houses. Slaughter-houses, gas-works, and factories near the river. Irish, Germans, and native population.

*Total vote*, 8,276; *Grant*, 4,989; *Opposition*, 3,287. Scott polled a plurality in only one out of forty-two election districts.

NINETEENTH DISTRICT.—From Fifty-second Street, along the west side of Central Park to Spuyten Duyvil. Apartment houses, tenements, family hotels, private houses. Many fine residences, homes of wealthier class. Poor tene-

ments near the river. Native population largely ; some Irish and Germans.

*Total vote*, 19,715 ; *Grant*, 9,694 ; *Opposition*, 10,021. The vote for Scott, however, was only 9,508, there being 156 blank and defective ballots, and the rest being cast for Labor and Prohibition candidates. Out of sixty-nine election districts Grant carried thirty-eight. Scott's strength was mainly between Sixty-eighth and One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Streets, in the fine residence neighborhood west of Central Park.

TWENTIETH DISTRICT.—East of Lexington Avenue between Forty-second and Fifty-ninth Streets. Tenements, flats, private houses. Germans, Irish, and native population of the working classes.

*Total vote*, 8,387 ; *Grant*, 5,081 ; *Opposition*, 3,306. Scott carried no election district.

TWENTY-FIRST DISTRICT.—Between Third and Sixth Avenues, Fortieth and Eighty-sixth Streets. Fine residence neighborhood, except on the east bordering on the railroad. Hotels, apartment houses, and homes of wealthiest residents.

*Total vote*, 8,063 ; *Grant*, 2,855 ; *Opposition*, 5,208. Out of twenty-seven election districts Grant carried only two. These were the ninth (143 to 96), between Fifth and Sixth Avenues and Fifty-first and Fifty-fifth Streets ; the fif-



teenth (147 to 119), between Lexington and Fifth Avenues, Fiftieth and Fifty-third Streets.

TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT.—East of Lexington Avenue and between Fifty-ninth and Ninety-first Streets. Tenements and private houses. Factories along river front. Population native, German, Bohemian, Irish, German Jews; foreign population predominating.

*Total vote*, 17,888; *Grant*, 9,632; *Opposition*, 8,256. Scott's vote was 7,146; 864 votes were cast for the Labor candidate. Scott carried twelve out of seventy-five election districts.

TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT.—North of Ninety-first Street and east of Seventh Avenue. A very mixed district. On the east side and southerly, tenement property, poor class of dwellings, factories; on the west and north sides, good business property and fine residences. Population on the west side native; on the east, Germans, Jews, and a large Italian colony.

*Total vote*, 21,076; *Grant*, 10,676; *Opposition*, 10,400. There were cast for Scott 9,671 ballots, and 393 for the Labor candidate. Out of eighty-one election districts Scott received a plurality in but twenty-three. Of these, seventeen are located north of One Hundred and Fifteenth Street, and most of them near Mt. Morris Park and northward along Seventh, Lenox, and Fifth Avenues.



But in this same region Grant also carried twelve or thirteen districts, including that contiguous to Mt. Morris Park on the west, north, and south—the best residence neighborhood of Harlem.

TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT.—The city north of the Harlem River. Suburban region of mixed character. Many private houses, small dwellings, stores, factories, and all classes of houses. Population mixed; natives, Irish, Germans, and various nationalities.

*Total vote*, 12,675; *Grant*, 6,525; *Opposition*, 6,150. Scott received 5,703 votes; the Labor candidate, 231. Scott carried sixteen election districts out of forty-one.

The foregoing facts and figures will tell the story of Tammany strength to the reader who is familiar with New York City, and will be of considerable assistance to the non-resident. It will be noticed that in a crucial year, when a determined effort was made to defeat Grant, the Tammany candidate, for reëlection as mayor, and a combination was effected of all parties and factions (saving two or three polling an insignificant vote), the Tammany ticket carried all but six out of twenty-four Assembly Districts. Of these six, the twelfth and thirteenth were nearly even, while in the nineteenth Scott, the Combination can-

didate, was behind; the Labor, scattering, and defective vote, counted as Opposition, throwing the balance that way. The decided anti-Tammany districts were, then, the seventh, eleventh, and twenty-first. That is, a narrow belt, of which Fifth Avenue is the centre, extending from Washington Square to Central Park, and thence along Fifth Avenue to Eighty-sixth Street, is the locality where the anti-Tammany voters are found to preponderate.

It will be noticed, also, that the supporters of Tammany Hall are confined to no nationality, nor even to foreign-born or foreign-descended citizens. In the second district, which contains Italians and Jews largely; in the third, containing a variety of nationalities; in the French quarter, in the German districts, in Greenwich Village, abounding in old native residents; among the negroes, along the west side in good residence neighborhoods, in Harlem, in the "Annexed District," filled with a very heterogeneous population, Tammany Hall received a plurality of votes. The only thing which is evident, as marking lines of separation, is the fact that the more wealthy and aristocratic people of the city are either indifferent or anti-Tammany. It may then help us to understand who are the Tammany supporters, if we adopt the method of contrast, and turn now to consider who are its opponents.

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE CRITICS AND OPPONENTS OF TAMMANY HALL.

It would naturally be supposed that the chief opponent of Tammany Hall would always be the Republican organization. The Republicans polled in 1892, 98,967 votes out of 284,984. They are of the opposite political party in national affairs. But they are not numerous enough to take the lead in fighting Tammany. Their position is such that often they will gain more for themselves by alliance and combination with it. Moreover, their own organization is very like that of Tammany Hall, though vastly less efficient. In this is a common ground of sympathy between them. Hence, on occasion the two will be found working together. Whether they are allies or otherwise, it is not from the Republican or any other "machine" organization that arises the sentiment of strong condemnation which one finds existing against Tammany and its methods.

If any one has taken pains to watch the rise and progress of movements in the city of New York, in the last twenty years, avowedly for muni-

cial reform, he will have been impressed with a singular circumstance, which, if he be a thoughtful student of political affairs, will be extremely suggestive. The present writer has observed with a good deal of care all these attempts, and found they invariably assume at the outset that their first and chief business is to defeat Tammany Hall. It is taken for granted that, the organization once overthrown, the victory will be won. Thus reform agitation means simply the establishment of an anti-Tammany party, under the idea that Tammany government is inherently vicious, while anti-Tammany government will be certain to be virtuous. Those who are believed to be actuated by higher principles respecting political action are invited, not to assist in particular reforms, not even to work for improvement without reference to party, but to join in organizing an anti-Tammany party. Non-partisan though such movements may be claimed to be, they ultimate in the formation of as strong an association as can be established, whose prime object is to overthrow the power of Tammany Hall. They imitate Tammany methods of organization and electioneering, and the result of their efforts, if successful, would be to substitute for the Tammany machine another machine, whose chief characteristic is opposition to Tammany.

The significance of these facts is that the opposition is founded on something deeper than reasonable and legitimate criticism of civil administration; otherwise we should sometimes find reformers supporting Tammany. For it is not conceivable that such an organization, in power by suffrage, should be wholly bad at all times and as respects all its candidates. The aversion is like a religious or a racial antipathy. A Frenchman dislikes a German because he is a German, not because he is a depraved man; or, perhaps, the Gaul determines that the Goth is depraved because he is a German. A Catholic in the times of the Inquisition thought that a Protestant must be satanic in character because he was a Protestant. So a Tammany man in the eyes of anti-Tammany must be a renegade *ipso facto*. When charges of various financial derelictions (since dismissed as unfounded) recently were brought in his own church against a prominent minister in New York, a newspaper, in commenting upon them, argued that they must be true, because the clergyman in question was a supporter of Tammany Hall, which fact was a certain indication of moral depravity!

What, then, are the underlying causes of this deep-rooted antipathy? To some extent, no doubt, it is really race prejudice, for the Irishman,

so prominent in Tammany councils, is not a favorite with everybody. Allied with this is often a dislike of the Roman Catholic Church, to which the Irish and Irish-Americans largely adhere. But the more deeply one looks into the matter, the more thoroughly will he be convinced that the difficulty is nothing else than the old quarrel between aristocracy and democracy, the disgust that common, plain, ordinary people of the "lower class" should control public affairs. It is Federalism over again. It is the paternal theory. It is the negation of the doctrine of equality. It is practical disbelief in the rule of the people.

I am quite aware that objection will at once be taken against the foregoing assertions on the ground of the despotic and oligarchical methods of the Tammany syndicate in dealing with its own followers. But I hope I have made it clear in the preceding pages that this government by the few does not spring from a sentiment of the natural relations of human beings in society, but is merely a business method which experience has shown to be the best to insure success. Outside of the affairs of the organization there is no class superiority or man-worship. The force of authority does not accumulate or extend. It is applied to the business in hand and kept there. The supporters of Tammany Hall understand this very

well ; they know that the sentiments of the leaders themselves are uncompromisingly democratic, and that they do represent the interests and wishes of the masses of the people. There is no danger of loss of political liberty through them, nor of improper usurpation. The reason why this is so has been pointed out by President Seth Low, of Columbia College, in a discussion of municipal government in Bryce's "American Commonwealth." \* He shows how the former theory that cities are little states has given place to the more accurate notion that they are large corporations. He then goes on to remark: "Americans are sufficiently adept in the administration of large business enterprises to understand that in any such undertaking some one man must be given the power of direction and the choice of his chief assistants ; they understand that power and responsibility must go together from the top to the bottom of every successful business organization. Consequently, when it began to be realized that a city was a business corporation rather than an integral part of the State, the unwillingness to organize the city upon the line of concentrated power in connection with concentrated responsibility began to disappear."

---

\* Third ed., 1893 ; part ii. chap. lii., vol. i. p. 656.



The aristocrat, on the other hand, as distinguished from the business organizer, believes in class superiority, and has an ingrained contempt for those whom he considers below him in social position, in character, or knowledge. He may have been educated to believe in liberty and be a foe to monarchical institutions. But still, aristocratic ideas possess him, control his feelings, and largely determine his action. He thinks his superiority ought to be conceded, and that he should be looked up to with some degree of reverence because of his position or excellence.

The aristocracy of social position has nothing but contempt for an organization like Tammany Hall. This disdain, indeed, frequently extends to all political association and all political action; but the sentiments of people of this sort are, to a very large extent, anti-Tammany. Theodore Roosevelt, in one of his "Essays on Practical Politics,"\* states "that four out of five of our wealthy and educated men, of those who occupy what is called good social position, are really ignorant of the nature of a caucus or a primary meeting, and never attend either; and this is specially true of the young men." He goes on to give reasons for this, among which is the fact that this class "is often out of sympathy—or, at

---

\* New York, 1888, p. 26.



least, its more conspicuous members are—with the feelings and interests of the great mass of the American people; for it is a sad and discreditable fact that it is in this class that what has been recently most aptly termed the ‘colonial’ spirit still survives.” It will not be forgotten that New York, at the time of the Revolution, was substantially a Tory city, and from that time to this the social aristocracy of the place has had little in common with the democratic masses. It cannot be expected that the inhabitant of the brown-stone or marble front on Fifth Avenue will consort with his janitors and their friends in the First Ward. Contact with them would sully him in his own estimation. A political society of which they are members would be inevitably objectionable to him. An examination of the localities in which the Tammany vote is strong, and of those in which it is weak, reveals at once the truth of these assertions. The wealthy, the ease-loving men of leisure, who are socially exclusive; those in whom pride of ancestry is a prominent trait; those who hate to be involved in the rough-and-tumble of life; those who do not like a position where they will be on an equality with the butcher and the groceryman, to say nothing of stevedores and day laborers, will, for the most part, be found among Tammany’s foes. In the

main they are blind opponents and ignorant critics. They have not the slightest conception of the value of government by the people, nor do they believe in it practically. With the wage-earner they have little sympathy in his strife for recognition as an integral part of the community. What is bestowed on him is *largesse*, springing from gracious magnanimity; that his will should be heeded in affairs of government, is a proposition the force of which they can never realize. Popular sovereignty they may theoretically indorse, but they are forever claiming, "We are the people."

Another group of antagonists to the ancient society we are considering may be styled the aristocracy of religious morality. Its members oppose Tammany Hall because of alleged wickedness. Here sin is incarnated. The organization is supposed to live and derive its nourishment from thieving, drunkenness, gambling, and harlotry. Its wages are the wages of sin, to accept which destroys the soul. They seldom ask what would be the degree of morality of any other syndicate that might control the city government. It is enough that they can find plenty of fault with the existing *régime*. Without weighing the probabilities of better things under a new order, they unhesitatingly use their influence against the present rule.

This class is made up of clergymen and church-going people of the Protestant faiths. As we saw in the last chapter, the Roman Catholic Church, generally speaking, supports Tammany Hall. This very fact explains some of the Protestant clerical antagonism against that association. But quite apart from this, the idea of the wickedness of a great city being fostered by the dominant political powers so possesses the minds of many religious people that they lose all ability to get at facts because of the strength of their antipathy. Besides, the depravity theory saves a vast amount of trouble to minds not strong enough to bear the strain of accurate inductive reasoning. Hence clergymen frequently indulge in denunciation, and often in the most unbridled vituperation, against the rulers of their city, thinking that by so doing they serve God and their fellow-citizens. Of course the influence of a crazy-brained zealot like one who commenced a crusade on vice in the metropolis by attacking and thoroughly antagonizing the police department, his natural and only effective ally, cannot count for much, but it always affects the minds of some who are accustomed to take their opinions from the pulpit, or who feel bound to support their spiritual guide in secular matters as well.

Still another class of enemies of Tammany Hall

consists of intellectual aristocrats. Educated men who believe that the government should be administered by those highly cultivated and intellectually trained, do not as a rule find much satisfaction with the methods of syndicate government. With them the training and intellectual habits of a person have a great deal to do with his fitness for office. It does not seem proper that a liquor-dealer, or a frequenter of saloons, or a gambler, or an ignorant tradesman, or a "roaming tough," should hold any municipal office, much less an important one. The argument that he will discharge the duties of a position well is not held sufficient. He must have the backing of respectable antecedents, and suitable preparation, to fit him for public duties. Even in the office of hog-reeve they would prefer that a Ralph Waldo Emerson should serve rather than a Patrick O'Flaherty.\* They want the "best men," which always means men of a high degree of intelligence and cultivation. They exclude from the eligible lists a large proportion of those who are habitually nominated by Tammany Hall for official position. Their ideals of good government are lofty, and they are inclined to insist on their standards uncompromisingly.

---

\* See Bryce's "American Commonwealth," part ii. ch. xlviii.; 3d ed., vol. i. p. 596.

It sometimes seems unfortunate that human nature should be so constituted as to make true the assertion of Bishop Brooks quoted in a former chapter,\* that the largest education of human nature is not an instruction but a friend. Yet the sciences of anthropology and sociology establish its truth. So does history; and, indeed, the whole theory of the Christian religion is based upon it, which was the lesson enforced by the bishop from his statement. Such being the case, it is not to be wondered at, though it may be regretted, that the best ideas will have little chance with the mass of the people without the attraction of personal sympathy. The practical man who distributes turkeys at Christmas throughout his district will generally be elected against the most pure-minded and able scholar in politics who ever lived. To the latter the gift of turkeys will be wholly repugnant. He will consider it bribery, or, at the very least, he will regard it as using an argument wholly irrelevant. But to his constituency it is *not* irrelevant, but extremely pertinent. They are not only quite willing to be bribed in that way, but they will be apt to suggest and insist on something of the sort. They will not recognize the "better element," nor take the "best

---

\* Chap. vi.

men," proposed by that element. They prefer to trust their interests to one of themselves rather than to one who will regard himself as their superior and expect them to follow his behests. Unfortunate are these facts, it may be contended, but who shall say this is not democracy?

The character of many men of the class now before us is such, it must be allowed, as to intensify the natural feeling of want of sympathy which arises from the difference of associations. The "superior person" is rarely friendly without being patronizing to the one he considers his inferior. And nothing is more quickly perceived and more angrily resented by the most of "common" people than any assumption of superiority. If the "superior person" reasons with the other in the strain, "My good fellow, I have thought this all out, and you must see I am right," the "good fellow" will at once see that the opposite proposition is the one which is right, and act accordingly. Moreover, the chances are that he will deal in the same way with every suggestion the "superior person" makes at that time and forever afterward. Jealousy of assumed greater intelligence is extremely powerful, and it is amazing to behold the fatuity of educated and enlightened men in overestimating their ability to accomplish results by the direct impact of their personality upon others

less favored than themselves, and in underestimating the good sense lying in the minds of the more common people, inconsequential and unreasonable as the latter may sometimes appear. If monarchy is so far away as not longer to arouse ire, the dislike of aristocracy of any kind is still very prevalent and strong. This is almost as true of an aristocracy of intellect as of wealth. Any apparent pride of intellect will quickly antagonize the voter who toils with his hands all day, but reads his penny paper and settles the affairs of the nation at the ale-house in the evening. Certainly it is a healthy sign when men are jealous of the right to form their own opinions, crude and superficial though these opinions be. If then such men, in the light of superior intelligence, are treated with scorn, or even—for human nature is sensitive—with want of respect, all attempts at conversion or education might as well be abandoned. The turkey distribution will be found much more efficacious than preaching the soundest doctrines, under such circumstances. The workingman will be educated, not by a counsel of perfection, but by the words of a friend, who has shown himself such by actions which appeal to human emotions.

General intelligence in regard to political affairs is widely diffused among the laboring classes, and their minds are active on the subject. Their mem-



bers believe that the intellectual aristocracy of which we are speaking cannot be trusted to protect their rights. Moreover, they believe it the intention to keep the reins of government in the hands of an aristocratic and exclusive class, not in close sympathy with them. They also believe that the zeal and enthusiasm displayed by these aristocrats depend largely upon whether the latter are advanced in power and influence and maintained in positions of leadership. Their beliefs seem to them justified by the arrogance and self-assertion of the "better element," its intolerance of anybody below its standard, and its unwillingness to work with others in subordinate positions. For chieftainship it is always qualified; for serving in the ranks, never. It is to be regretted that these notions have a good deal of truth for their basis. The writer well remembers how, in a certain reform movement, half a dozen men who had taken the lead in formulating the measures proposed, and in public advocacy of them, issued an appeal for financial assistance, in which they said that while it was true that those who had been leading the movement in other respects were the best fitted also to collect funds, all the work could not be done by this few, who were hence compelled to ask the personal efforts of their friends in the direction indicated! The force of arrogance



and insolence could no farther go. And yet such men wonder why their reform movements do not succeed! If they would diligently read the Gospels, and note how Jesus of Nazareth succeeded, they might find a lesson to be applied to themselves.

Having now specified the classes in the community opposed to Tammany constitutionally, so to speak, from congenital differences of sentiments and character, it remains to observe that both from these classes, and without their pale, are opponents who, uninfluenced by bias of the kind just referred to, are disbelievers in the system, and think that the civil administration afforded under the auspices of Tammany Hall is bad service to the people, is corrupt, indefensible, and dangerous. Many honest and intelligent men occupy this position, and wherever they, in any spirit of fairness, charge bad government upon facts which they can present, their words ought always to be heeded, their accusations investigated; and if the indictment be sustained, punishment ought to follow. This result is certain, sooner or later. No association of men can long control the government of a large city unless they govern reasonably well. The fact that Tammany Hall has succeeded in holding the popular vote against determined opposition is



strong evidence of its efficiency as a governmental institution.

There are very many people who oppose the Tammany administration from less worthy motives than these last. All those who are *outs* and have the desire to be of the *ins* are always ready to fight the dominant party and dethrone it if they can. These comprise sore-heads within the organization, who are dissatisfied with the distribution of patronage, and ambitious men of all other factions and parties, who think that in a change of administration their chances for emolument or preferment would be improved. Every successful party has this kind of opposition. Sometimes it becomes formidable, but it has no special significance. It represents no principle or policy. It is glad to seize upon any pretext to inaugurate a campaign, and to circulate any falsehood which it believes will contribute to success in its antagonism. If, however, there be failure, the same people who are loud in their condemnation will often be found repentant and humble suppliants for favor at the hands of the victors. One of the current criticisms upon the present Tammany management is that too many of this class have been taken into the fold and rewarded at the expense of the faithful and constant veterans of the organization.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE EVIL AND THE GOOD IN TAMMANY GOVERNMENT.

THE advantages of government by syndicate emanate from what President Low sets forth as a necessity for the efficient management of large corporations—concentration of power in connection with concentration of responsibility.\* Its evils arise principally from the commercial character of the undertaking submerging the sentiment of duty to the community in the eagerness of private interest. Tammany Hall exemplifies both the good and the evil thus flowing from this form of municipal administration. As to which is in the ascendant, there will be a difference of opinion. But it seems to me a careful and judicial examination of facts will convince an unprejudiced mind that the good preponderates.

In order to preserve itself from disintegration the organization must put into office men who have been serviceable to it. It naturally happens that service thus rendered often takes precedence of considerations of fitness. Hence the public

---

\* See chap. xi., p. 96.

interest suffers. A man who may be exceedingly popular in his district and able to control a large vote may be wholly destitute of those qualities which would be necessary for high public office. Nevertheless, the ambition of that man may demand recognition and the leaders be forced to give it to him. This frequently has occurred, and created scandal. It is liable to take place at any time. The check upon it from within the society is the superior law of self-preservation. The organization cannot afford to keep in office men flagrantly unfit. What frequently happens is that a person whose antecedents are such as to create distrust is allowed to take official place and is put upon his good behavior. Sometimes this has worked very well, but that it is a dangerous rule of procedure cannot be doubted. Yet it ought to be said that the greater part of the criticism directed against Tammany Hall is made upon the appointment or nomination of men who, from their past record, are deemed below the standard the critics set up, rather than upon any actual malfeasance in office. If the latter occurs, it is rebuked by the organization itself as well as by the public in general. Sometimes the rebuke comes pretty late, but certainly no later than it would from any political party, which is naturally loath to discredit its own nominees.

See?

The use of public office for private gain is another evil made more likely by following the principle of rewarding fidelity to the organization without due regard to qualifications for the duties of the position. That the ultimate aim with men who are elected or appointed is selfish in the large majority of instances, cannot be denied; but unless they are woefully lacking in intelligence they know the necessary limitations upon ambition. If their purposes are dishonest, they will rarely dare to go to the point of open defiance of law. Indictable offences are not frequently committed by Tammany Hall officials. The greatest municipal scandal of recent years—that of the Broadway railroad franchise—was chargeable upon the County Democracy, at that time a formidable opponent of Tammany Hall. The result of this was the utter ruin of the County organization; while the vote cast against the franchise in the Board of Aldermen by Hugh J. Grant, of Tammany Hall, was the beginning of that gentleman's rise to municipal eminence, culminating in two terms of the mayoralty.

Unquestionably the making of money indirectly through the opportunities afforded by municipal office is very common. Some of this may be perfectly legitimate, so long as official duties are not neglected. How much is made dishonestly, no

one can say ; but if any be made at all, the fact must be carefully and skilfully concealed. It is commonly charged that the police force has for years maintained a system of blackmail upon saloons, gambling houses, and brothels. But when, during the past year, the Society for the Prevention of Crime made the most diligent efforts to get evidence of such dereliction on the part of the police, the only result was the conviction of their own chief agent of this very crime ! The reasonable conclusion in the matter is that such blackmailing does transpire, and always has under every administration, but that it is not as extensive nor as flagrant as is claimed.

Direct peculation does not occur, nor under the present system is it easy to see how it can occur, so many and so efficient are the checks upon all municipal officers. Nor are sinecures numerous in proportion to the number of offices. It may be said, though, that in this category should be placed the heads of some departments, who draw large salaries, and have their work done by deputies who are also paid by the city, the chiefs giving their time more to politics than to municipal business. A considerable portion of their salaries, also, finds its way into the treasury of Tammany Hall, in the form of contributions and assessments. Hence there is, no doubt, a waste of city funds

arising in this manner, greater or less throughout the whole government. It is a charge upon individuals, who in turn are rewarded with salaried offices, and pay this charge out of their salaries. But when we go over the municipal list, we cannot say that, all things considered, salaries are excessively high for the most of the offices. Probably the two positions most obnoxious to criticism of this kind are the offices of Sheriff and County Clerk; but in both of these, important and substantial reforms have been made in recent years—and that, too, under Tammany government.

While any fair-minded person can see the imperfections in the municipal administration of New York City, he will also perceive, if he be fair-minded, that they are habitually exaggerated by journalistic and other critics, and by opponents of the ruling powers springing from the various classes mentioned in the last chapter. In many instances the broad statements made of corruption and misrule are absolutely untrue. In special cases the facts are frequently perverted and explanatory facts are suppressed. In general, the tone and color of comment from these critics is such as to give to any outsider a wholly false idea of the condition of affairs in the city. He would suppose that New York was governed by a set of



thugs; that robbery of public funds was an everyday occurrence; that crime went unpunished; that life and property were not safe; that political chaos existed. That such is the opposite of the truth is clear to the man who knows. If one takes pains to compare the tax rates of New York City with those of other cities in the country, he will find ample food for reflection, the issue of which will not be to the discredit of New York. Nor is it true that the valuation is disproportionately high, or that it has been raised for the sake of lowering the rate. As to the other matters, there is no city in the United States where conviction and punishment for crime are so certain, none where life and property are so safe. To-day the various municipal departments are in a sound condition, while some of them—notably the Police, the Fire, and the Health—are conspicuous for their excellence of management and their effectiveness. Despite all shortcoming and all acts of positive misfeasance, New York City has been well-governed during the present period of Tammany supremacy. And this is the opinion of a majority of those who care enough about the city to cast their ballots at election time.

Professor James Bryce has recently published a revised edition of Volume I. of his valuable book entitled "The American Commonwealth."



I venture to think his work would have been greatly improved if he had revised Chapter LI., "The Working of City Government," a little more. In this chapter he takes New York as the worst example of "extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement" in municipal administration. Political vices in New York "have revealed themselves on the largest scale. They are 'gross as a mountain, open, palpable.' " \* The author supports his conclusions by the report of Governor Tilden's commission of 1876. He should have considered that this is ancient history. The report, which is itself retrospective, so far as it applies to the city of New York is based upon the occurrences of the Tweed *régime*. Decided changes for the better have occurred since that date. For example, the debt of the city in 1876, mentioned by Mr. Bryce at the figure of \$113,000,000, is shown on the preceding page of his book to have been reduced in 1891 to \$97,857,230. Improvements in the methods of election have come in. The concentration of power and responsibility has been going on. The departments have been purified, and from year to year been placed upon a better business foundation. The past seventeen years have been years of notable progress. President Seth

---

\* 3d ed., vol. i., p. 637.

Low, in the chapter of Mr. Bryce's book immediately following the one I have been criticising, gives a much more just statement of the condition of affairs. He says, and he certainly speaks from a point of view which includes the observation of New York, that cities are not going from bad to worse. "There is substantial reason for thinking that the general tendency, even in the larger cities, is toward improvement. Life and property are more secure in all of them than they used to be. Certainly there has been no decrease of security such as might be expected from increased size. Less than a score of years ago it was impossible to have a fair election in New York or Brooklyn. To-day, and for the last decade under the present system of registry laws, every election is held with substantial fairness. The health of our cities does not deteriorate, but on the average improves. So that in the large and fundamental aspect of the question the progress, if slow, is steady in the direction of better things."\* "It is probable that no other system of government would have been able to cope any more successfully on the whole with the actual conditions that American cities have been compelled to face. . . . Whatever defects have marked the progress of

---

\* 3d ed., vol. i., p. 664.

such cities, no one acquainted with their history will deny that since their problem assumed its present aspect, progress has been made, and substantial progress, from decade to decade." \*

It is quite evident that foreign writers, even of the thorough and impartial abilities of Mr. Bryce, receive impressions which unduly exaggerate political vice and corruption in the United States; and they get them from Americans themselves, of the pharisaical and aristocratic classes, who do not believe in their own theory of government. This clearly appears from Mr. Bryce's chapters on city governments. He comments on the circumstance that the admirable satisfaction of the people of the United States with their own institutions is wholly absent as regards municipal administration. "Wherever there is a large city there are loud complaints." "What Dante said of his own city may be said of the cities of America; they are like the sick man who finds no rest upon his bed, but seeks to ease his pain by turning from side to side." † There is no one more to blame for the erroneous ideas which foreign students, and people outside of New York generally, entertain, than the citizens of that city themselves, of cultivation and intelligence, who, having no civic pride, no

---

\* 3d ed., vol. i., p. 666.

† Ibid., p. 649.

sympathy with the mass of the people, no comprehension of the logic of events, no toleration of imperfection, keep up a constant fire of hostile criticism, caricature, and invective against the organization to which the voters have chosen to intrust municipal power. There are some journals, which undoubtedly have more weight with a writer like Mr. Bryce from the fact that they claim to be non-partisan, whose articles systematically charge upon Tammany Hall every political vice, every official misconduct or shortcoming, and never allow it the slightest credit for any success or any rectitude of action upon the part of its appointees. If a Tammany referee or special commissioner has his bill cut down by the court, it is always a "rebuke to Tammany greed," the newspaper never calling attention to the fact that it is a Tammany judge who administers the rebuke. If a Tammany mayor appoints to office a man of unsavory antecedents, it is the occasion of fierce denunciation of the Hall. But nothing is said when another Tammany mayor keeps the same man out of office, against the demands of his organization, except that the latter mayor, though just as villanous, had not the courage to face public sentiment! If the tax-rate has been lowered by Tammany administration, the valuation has been put up to deceive the people. If a

watchful and able official is found who has been indorsed by Tammany Hall, it is because the organization dared not set him aside. If a man gets into a street brawl, who happens to be on the General Committee, he is a sample of the rulers who govern "this God-accursed, Tammany-ridden city." And even if the mayor and other city officials attempt to show civility to distinguished visitors, their wives and daughters are shamefully disparaged, the "better element" regarding this as an attempt of Tammany to sneak into good society, and being forced "to hang its head in shame" that people of other lands should be obliged to meet this "Tammany gang" as representatives of the metropolis!

Such vituperation, in some quarters, is incessant and malignant. It is greatly to the credit of the Tammany leaders that they are not given to retorting abuse on their opponents. Their feeling is that the vote is a sufficient answer. Mr. Richard Croker declares of the organization in an article in the *North American Review*: "While it does not claim to be exempt from error, it does claim to be always aiming at success by proper and lawful methods, and to have the good of the general community always in view as its end of effort. Such an organization has no time or place for apologies or excuses; and to indulge in them

would hazard its existence and certainly destroy its usefulness." Whatever may be said of the necessities of justification, this statement shows certainly a more dignified attitude than that displayed by the journalistic and other representatives of the "better element." It is high time that this indiscriminate, wholesale, and unjust abuse of Tammany Hall, among people of education and refinement, were stopped. Come, now, gentlemen, you who are all the time complaining of the selfish, unpatriotic, corrupt character of the organization you denounce, do you show much civic loyalty, much patriotism, much respect for your neighbors, or regard for their reputation or welfare, when with so great animosity you persevere in a course of misrepresentation and abuse, which does no good at home, and which can only result in making the city in which you and your families dwell a stench in the nostrils of the outside world within the sphere of your influence?

There are many earnest students of political movements who, while recognizing the fact that an able and honest administration of the city's affairs may occur under Tammany management, deprecate the system itself and believe it ought to be eradicated, root and branch, as undemocratic, uncertain in its operation, and dangerous to liberty and security. To such I would respectfully com-

mend for consideration the matters suggested in the earlier chapters of this essay. They will force us to the conclusion that whether or not the system of government by syndicate is ideally the best, it is, under present conditions, inevitable in great cities. The tendency to combination and to specialization of function is so universal and so strong that it cannot successfully be resisted. If Tammany be thrown out of power, it can only be done by another organization of a similar character. It may, indeed, now and then be defeated by a popular uprising, occasioned by some piece of bad management or some scandalous official behavior; but this will only be a temporary check. For its permanent subjugation another syndicate would be required, based upon like ideas, held together by like purposes and like interests. Of whom must such an association be composed? There is no one else to be found except the same class of people that belong to Tammany Hall. The "better element" cannot be relied upon for two principal reasons; the one that its members are too independent for combined action, the other that not enough of them can be induced to take the requisite interest in politics. Moreover, it is doubtful if they are numerous enough to give the tone to a political organization which would be of practical strength. Hence, the



constituency of Tammany Hall would have to be drawn from to establish a new successful organization. If established, it could only be maintained by the same methods as the old one. Where, then, is the gain to the public? In the revolution which would overthrow Tammany Hall, new men would come to the front, a flood of new legislation would be poured upon the city, the departments would be unsettled by removals, new appointments, and the uncertainties of a new *régime*. While, here and there, better men might be put into office, the general result would be no improvement. Add to this the probability that the new order would be but temporary, with further confusion and change to follow, in the outcome there will be found to be a loss and not a gain as regards the interests of the community. If there is to be "machine" government, the old machine, tested by long practical operation, is preferable to the new one, respecting whose excellence of construction and working capacity we must be uncertain.

If it be true that the ignorant and criminal classes, crude foreigners, lawless citizens, and "plug-uglies" flock to the support of Tammany Hall and vote its tickets with regularity, the respectable public at large ought to be very grateful for the perfection of that despotic system by which the whole body is controlled by a few lead-



ers. That Tammany has its share of voters of the above description, there is no doubt. But it has no monopoly of them. The Republican and the other Democratic organizations have always had their quota. Yet, conceding that Tammany controls the vote of what the "better element" would call the "lower classes," and considering in any event the heterogeneous character of its supporters, the discipline under which the organization is controlled from the top is most admirable for the public interest. If measures were proposed and candidates nominated by undirected and unrestrained suffrage, without reflection and comparison, does any one suppose that the result would be as satisfactory as the present scheme? It is far better in every way for the city that half-educated, wholly illiterate, and newly naturalized voters should be held, if they can be, under the influence and sway of a strong, well-compacted, and centralized organization; that they be taught an allegiance to it, and learn to obey the behests of its commanders. The importance of this for the public weal should not be overlooked. When the tyranny of the leaders is reprobated, it should not be forgotten that dictation and a firm hand in supporting it are not only necessary for the political society, but are of no mean value to the community at large.

However contrary to the theory of democracy it may be, it is truly a fortunate circumstance that the concentration of power and responsibility has been carried to such a degree in an organization which, like Tammany Hall, has gained supremacy in the politics of a great city. Whether, then, its government be good or bad, depends upon its leaders. If they are sagacious men, if they understand the conditions under which their syndicate government can alone exist, if they restrain the greed of their followers and moderate their own ambitions, if they can preserve the organization and serve the public interest—a thing by no means easy of accomplishment—if they can educate their followers to sufficient loyalty and a high enough appreciation of their association to act upon the truth that the best service to party is to render the best service to the city, they will continue to maintain their power, despite hostile combinations, and the criticism and hatred of the aristocracy of wealth, position, and intellect. But the success of Tammany Hall, as I have before stated, will yet be dependent both on its loyalty to the Democratic party and on its furnishing the city with a good administration of municipal affairs. Not even an organization as powerful as this could stand against flagrant malfeasance in office. The implied contract with the

people must be respected. If not, there will be retribution, inevitable and severe. Such words as the following, which were addressed to and read in Tammany Hall at the Independence Day celebration of 1893, are always pertinent and in order, and furnish a thoroughly sound rule of practical politics :

“If those who now celebrate the anniversary of American Independence guard against the sordid struggle for unearned wealth that stifles patriotism ; if they exact from public servants the strictest accountability in the performance of public duty ; if they hold fast to the American idea that work is honorable and economy a virtue ; if they insist that there should be honesty and truthfulness and cleanliness in politics, and if they refuse to encourage expedients that endanger the foundations of sound national finance, those who follow us will joyously celebrate the day in centuries yet to come.”\*

From what has been said I hope it may appear that government by syndicate is not necessarily bad government, that it may on the contrary be good government, and that it is at present inevitable in large cities. The actions of such a syndicate must be judged not by an absolute but a

---

\* Grover Cleveland.

relative standard. If the ideal is not attained, it is perfectly relevant to inquire, "Who can do better?" And the measure of success must be determined by an examination of existing conditions. How to improve those conditions, we are now prepared to consider to some extent in the following chapters. But, before passing on, there is one point more upon which we ought to touch.

The peculiar province of syndicate government is a large city, which, as President Low well puts it, is not a small state but a large corporation. The extension of the same system to the State presents new considerations. It is safe to say that the syndicate plan never can prevail to any great extent in national politics. The interests are too vast, too divergent, too little susceptible of close-corporation management, to be represented and controlled otherwise than by the political party in the larger sense. But in the State governments the syndicate has made its appearance, and conducted its operations with success in many cases. Now it is a railroad ring, now a canal ring; here a mining ring, there a manufacturing ring. Through their various manipulations private measures have occupied the important part of the attention of legislatures, and the balancing of private interests has been the main thing to be accomplished in order to carry through

any legislation. But this has been happening, more or less, in all the country's history. The special condition to be deprecated is the application of the system of giving and taking orders, as between legislators and the leaders of local organizations. With this, of course, goes that transfer of responsibility from the individual to which I made reference in Chapter VII. This is in entire opposition to the whole scheme of representation. It destroys the independent sovereignty of the legislature within its sphere, and threatens the foundations of State government. Better the lobby, with its possibilities of corruption of individuals, than a set of members upon whose souls rests no sense of personal responsibility to the people as lawmakers. Not the least of the evils of such a method of procedure as makes the legislator a mere registering machine, is that men of the most competence for legislative work will not under such circumstances accept place in the legislature. There it is their right and their duty to regard themselves as beyond the position of a subordinate in managing the affairs of a large corporation. They must be allowed autonomy, and if they do not have it, they will not serve. This certainly is the tendency of things, and it is entirely contrary to Democratic principles in a field where Democracy has not yet abdicated its throne.

The Speaker of the New York Assembly of 1893 remarked, in a public meeting, of the work of the legislature: "All legislation emanated from Tammany Hall, and was dictated by that great statesman, Richard Croker." This was uttered in the presence of Mr. Richard Croker, who made no disclaimer; but it would have been a good stroke of practical politics if he had immediately spanked the Speaker and sent him to bed. The statement was certainly a little broader than leading men in other parts of the State would be willing to indorse. But the general course of things has been recently toward absolutism on the part of local leaders with respect to members of the legislature from their districts. It is wrong in principle, it is dangerous in practice to those who employ it, not likely to be successful for long, and inimical to the interest of the larger political party whose representatives are involved. Action must be adapted to circumstances; and that course which is practicable and successful for the municipality is not, therefore, to be unhesitatingly and unthinkingly adopted as wise for a wider field and different conditions.

It is not my purpose to maintain that there are no imperfections or iniquities in the system of municipal government in vogue in New York City. Nor do I claim that the Tammany admin-

istrations have given no ground for just criticism. But for reasons which have been stated, it is apparent that there is commonly formed an unjust estimate of the extent of the evils suffered under the present *régime*. Equally certain is it that whatever blame is to be charged is ordinarily not fairly distributed. The truth of the matter is that the business community is primarily and chiefly responsible for political corruption of all sorts, and particularly with interferences with legislation for private ends. This is not only true of the city of New York, but of all our cities. With far too many, business is war, which must be conducted according to customs, indeed, but is without moral quality. This condition of affairs we detailed at the outset. No advantage is too mean or contemptible to be taken, no hardship too great to be inflicted, in the course of industrial competition. There is not the slightest hesitation on the part of reputable merchants or large corporations to defraud the government, if they can do it successfully. Nor is there any reluctance to spend money to purchase political favor. And the very men who are willing to do these things are loudest in their denunciations of municipal corruption. If they were the only people concerned, the government of Tammany Hall would be infinitely too good for them. Be



that as it may, the weight of blame for whatever maladministration occurs in the city, or for iniquitous legislation at Albany, should not be cast upon the Tammany system, or upon the organization, but upon the citizens themselves, or a large class of them, who are ready at any time to use the powers of government for their own advantage, and habitually attempt to do so. Until, then, we so modify industrial warfare as to introduce a sense of duty into commercial dealings by which the seller feels that he is in some degree concerned with the buyer's interests, that he is to give value for what he receives, that he is in a measure his brother's keeper, we shall hope in vain for any perfection of government. No doubt improvement in these respects will tend to repress what we call "enterprise;" but when enterprise gets to producing vicious results, it is time it were repressed. To this end, more profoundly than anything else, do we need a curbing of that restless activity for success and domination which urges on to the attainment of something, we scarcely know what, except that it is; as we think, better and bigger than anything our neighbor gets. It is this striving which makes us trample on the weak, and callous to fraud. It gives us shrivelled souls. It produces what Goethe calls "problematic characters," "who are not equal to any situation in life



and whom no situation satisfies." It disorganizes society, and it prevents, too, the realization of individual happiness, for it especially forecloses enjoyment of the many pleasant things of life near at hand, within the reach of every one in any sphere, if only there be the eye to see them and the heart to appreciate them. These are lost in the mad rush for wealth or fame, and no adequate compensation is supplied. If we start on a race over the world, wishing that the devil may take the hindmost, and in our enthusiasm run too fast, we shall find, mayhap, when we have made the circuit of the globe, and the devil appears, that, because of our very haste, it is ourselves who are bringing up the rear of the procession !

## CHAPTER XIII.

### SOME SPECIAL COUNTERACTIVES AGAINST EVIL.

BECAUSE political affairs are not in so bad a condition as they seem, is no reason why they should not be bettered if they can be. But unless the causes of any particular situation are studied and the motive forces of human nature involved in it are reckoned with, efforts toward change are blundering and useless. Hence associations which partake, or are thought to partake, of the "holier-than-thou" character, must be managed with the utmost care, or they will defeat their own end. They will not commend themselves to the masses, and must not expect to succeed if they enter the lists with candidates of their own ilk. The idea of perpetuating a "mugwump" movement by organization is a dream which has not even the charm of iridescence. It is self-contradictory. Victories obtained through the independent voters are cataclysmic in their nature, and cataclysms cannot happen every day. The effect of such triumphs is that of a protest, followed by a reversal, or some decided modification, of action. When the immediate purpose is accomplished, through

good organization it may be, permanence of that organization can only mean achieving success, if at all, by adopting and maintaining precisely the same methods and using exactly the same materials as employed by the enemy against which the original uprising took place. Then the argument employed in the last chapter again comes into use. Of what benefit to the public is the new organization? A new "machine" is created, no better than the old one. No doubt citizens' movements are excellent upon occasion, as a corrective. But that occasion does not arrive every year. If, however, the movements do, or if they hold over, they will lose their moral effect, and not only fail of success, but make such agitation, when really needed, much more difficult and doubtful. And when an organization of the "better element," like the People's Municipal League in the New York City election of 1890, knowing its weakness, seeks some measure of success by combining with one or more factions of what it considers the "worse element," upon the principle of farming on shares, it simply sells its birthright for a mess of pottage, which is not a very soul-satisfying performance—especially if one does not get the pottage! In the case just mentioned there was a combination against Tammany Hall, made by an independent "citizens'" association, the

County Democracy machine, and the Republican party machine, with a division of offices upon the ticket between the three elements. There was no true reform in the combination, and it deserved to be defeated. So the voters thought when election day came.

In the city of New York, the methods adopted to secure changes in the government seem to have had the effect to solidify and strengthen Tammany Hall within itself, and increase the power of that organization in the community. This is always the case with intemperate and unreasonable opposition. Moreover, from the antagonisms thus generated, reforms no doubt have been defeated or delayed which might have been effected if urged skilfully and carefully. It seems certain that the first thing to be done to improve conditions in New York, or to maintain good administration, is for reformers to cease abuse of Tammany Hall and refrain from always turning a reform organization into an anti-Tammany party. Particular measures can be advocated and promoted by organization. Officials can be watched and criticised. Maladministration can be exposed, and movements made against dishonest or incompetent officials. Pressure can be brought for the enforcement of laws, and resistance presented to improvident actions. All this is quite

practicable without bringing a wholesale indictment against a party, the sure effect of which is to arouse in that party all the instincts of self-preservation. We do not reform a man very fast when we start out with a gun to kill him.

The tendency toward specialization of functions, to which I have frequently referred, finds another illustration in a fact which is of great importance to the public as furnishing a most efficient check upon bad government. The newspapers have assumed the task of keeping watch over the public interests in all the branches of government. Time was when the press was almost universally the servant of party, and was muzzled as to anything reflecting upon its masters. Nor did it have its present enterprise, skill, and resources in ferreting out news. But the great metropolitan journals are now conducted on the idea that journalism is a business which can be perfected only by the fullest development of publicity in regard to everything. This has its reprehensible effects, to be sure ; but these we need not now consider. It is enough to note that they have become much more, and in some cases totally, independent of party or syndicate, in their news-gathering and news-dispensing departments. They can rarely be bought to conceal news. Thus, they have become inspectors and accusers in behalf

of the people, whose power is recognized and feared by public officials from the highest to the lowest. They have found this much more remunerative than the old style of journalism, and there is no danger of their returning to former methods. So, to counterbalance the increasing lack of interest on the part of the people, especially of the better class, in the affairs of government, there has arisen a set of censors, far more efficacious than any that could be constituted by authority. Their action is incessant, and their vigilance does not sleep. The improved condition of government in our cities which has unquestionably taken place within the past twenty years is due more to the great extension in the scope and energy of journalism than to any other cause.

It may not occur on first thought, but it is certainly true, that the spirit of combination and organization, which has led to the concentration of power in the hands of rings and bosses in the political party and the syndicate, has developed along with itself its own counteractives. The complex organization of the newspaper is a case of machine against machine. But centripetal force has also set in operation disintegrating forces. The independent voter, the "mugwump," has been made numerous by the accumulation of political

power in the hands of a few. When this commenced, the old loyalty to the party, in which the voice of the majority was the voice of the people, began to decay. In relinquishing to a few managers the control of political affairs, the feeling of duty to support propositions or candidates respecting which or regarding whom they had no voice of approval or disapproval, necessarily tended to die out in the breasts of a great number of those who liked to think for themselves and were intelligent enough to do so. This, of course, has prevented the omnipotence of the bosses. Even though not actively exercised, the reserve power thus created is sufficient to make party management careful. Every now and then an occasion arises when this independent vote spontaneously concentrates with most astonishing results, bringing dismay to those who believed themselves strongly intrenched in power. It is the failure to understand such a situation that makes many "practical politicians" so fatuously impractical. But often whom the gods destroy they first make mad, and the pride of power in actual enjoyment notoriously contracts the vision. Yet though the young braves of the party may shout derision and contempt for the independent voter, the old chiefs lie low and think it better not to wake a sleeping lion.

Especially is the importance of the independent



voter established by the introduction of ballot reform. Against the power conferred by this mode of expressing opinion, persuasion and intimidation are of no avail. Dictation does not count, and bribery is generally futile; at least, it is so uncertain as not to be depended on. If nominations could be made more freely, the independent voter would have a better chance to make his influence felt; but as it is, the practical politician, if he is fit to manage his business, will never ignore in his calculations the mugwump element in the voting population. Hon. John A. Taylor, ex-corporation counsel of Brooklyn, in an essay entitled "The Independent in Politics,"\* observes: "In the campaign of 1884 it was noticeable that while the party organs could scarcely detect the existence of any considerable body of mugwumps in the State of New York, there was an actual personal enrollment of fifty thousand bolters from the Republican party in the possession of the managers of the independent revolt. And in the election for the mayoralty which took place in this city [Brooklyn] in 1885, more than thirteen thousand voters left their party lines to vote under conditions which assured to them no other success at the polls than their enumeration as men who dis-

---

\* Brooklyn Ethical Association: "The Man and the State." D. Appleton & Co., 1892, p. 497.



dained to follow their party in what, in their judgment, were policies prejudicial to the best interests of the city. Surely the tyranny of no party majority can be very dangerous with so large a body of independent voters ready to administer a prompt rebuke to its pretensions."

Mr. Albert Stickney, in a work entitled "Democratic Government,"\* puts forth, as the basis of true democracy, the public meeting, in which each person has one voice, freely uttered and considered for its reasonable value. The New England town meeting is, perhaps, the best example of this democratic society. But elsewhere, and particularly in crowded centres, genuine democracy has failed. The people do not care to discharge their duties as citizens, but prefer to allow others than themselves to undertake the tasks of government. Under a militant *régime*, as we have before remarked, this would be fatal to liberty. In our country it is not even dangerous. The newspaper takes the place of the town meeting. The independent, secure in his vote by the secret ballot, holds an effective check upon party corruption and greed. But in order to make the regulative power complete, some system of freer nominations ought certainly

---

\* Harper & Bros., 1885.

to be devised. It is now a difficult and ponderous matter to accomplish independent nominations to office. Hence, the independent is handicapped. Efforts in the way of remedying this state of things certainly would be well-directed.

But the most important matter of all at the present juncture is limiting the power of legislatures to do harm. The organic law is well settled for all the purposes of security, and the great danger is that it will be interfered with. Besides, the legislature has become in many States of the Union only a market-place for the purchase and sale of private emoluments, so much so that the people are always relieved when the two houses adjourn. In many States this condition of things has led to the adoption of biennial sessions, to the great gain of the public. The State of New York has suffered as much as any from this evil, and if the constitutional convention to assemble next year can devise amendments to the fundamental law which will stop legislative interference with local government and put substantial checks upon private legislation, it will accomplish a work greatly needed, and confer a lasting benefit upon the commonwealth.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### GENERAL REMEDIES AND ULTIMATE TENDENCIES.

TURNING now from concrete examples, and recurring to the thoughts of the earlier chapters of this essay, we are again impressed with the great and final lesson that all the evils of our political life emanate, not from any system of government, not from the dominance of any party or syndicate, but from the character of the people, which has been affected by changes of civilization in the way I have described. Hence no special reformatory measures are of avail till character in the citizen is so changed that somehow there is a restoration of the sense of duty as a motive force. Our people are too solicitous about their rights; too little concerned about their duties. It is not thus in every democracy. Mr. Bryce, in an article entitled "The Teaching of Civic Duty," \* relates the following incident: "Some years ago, in a lovely mountain valley in the canton of Glarus [Switzerland], I was

---

\* New York, *The Forum*, July, 1893.

conversing with a peasant land-owner about the Landsgemeinde (popular primary assembly), which regulates the affairs of the canton. After he had given me some details, I asked him whether it was not the fact that all citizens had the right of attending and voting in this assembly. 'It is not so much their right,' he replied, 'as their duty.' Professor Bryce adds: "This is the spirit by which free governments live."

Neglect of the cultivation of the sense of duty takes the heroic out of human nature. No doubt there is some truth (though not unqualified truth) in the charge that in the American democracy great men have ceased to be and can never more arise. For, it is argued, if the leader be only a follower, an observer and not an originator, occupied with the state of mind of his own army instead of planning against the enemy, he will tend to become an ordinary time-server, incapable of great deeds. But this argument is based upon the military idea of greatness. The destinies of people are not, in our happier country at least, determined by the clash of arms. Such power as once, on the Plains of Abraham, a young man of thirty-three, with less than ten thousand soldiers, was able to wield, to win a great empire on this continent, can only be employed by young men of our day in a thousand differentiations, scat-

tered here and there, apparently wasted in exhausting and disheartening details. Yes, we may lament, the giants are dead ! No "god-like Achilles" walks on heroic ground, with impetuous tread, glorious for aggressive warfare ; no William the Silent, "tranquil among the raging billows," emerges triumphant through his steadfastness in defence, bringing freedom to his nation and exciting the wonder of the world. Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan have passed away, and did they live, their glory would be of the past. Indeed, when by death all things are consecrated, there is not even left the opportunity and pleasure of dying well. Yet after all should we wish for the deadly combat in which many must perish unnoticed that we may win honor and fame ? Should we raise the storm with its dangers and its destruction in order that our greatness may shine forth ? The material of which heroes are made can exist in any time and almost any circumstances ; and no true hero ever wished glory at the expense of disaster to others. The truly great are they who most perfectly adapt themselves to their age, and who, with the willingness to serve, find their opportunity in some phase of the life which goes on around them. Then, if a wider prospect be opened to them, they are able to avail themselves of it successfully ; if the circumstances allow, they are

as certain to develop into the heroic size as any whose deeds have made them immortal. Abraham Lincoln never thought of glory; but when the occasion arrived, he came out from his simple and prosaic life and sat where the eyes of the world gazed upon him, where thrones were below him, and where all the honor of the nations was brought unto him.

Nevertheless, the fact is painfully evident in our own country, that when men are put into places of prominence they do not expand to heroic proportions with that degree of uniformity one could wish. The men who dignify office are few, for those who would dignify it are not put into office. If the "simple great ones," of whom Tennyson declares that they have "gone forever and forever by," were now to occupy official station, they would not be tolerated, for they would not recognize the truth that to be a master one must be an apt and obedient servant. Indeed, they would probably be as ridiculous as Don Quixote, high-minded and chivalrous, but an impractical "crank." It is perfectly true that the men who succeed in official station are those who know how to adapt means to ends; to placate, to satisfy, to harmonize conflicting interests; to fry out from the fat the oil with which the wheels may be greased to make the machine run more

easily. If they are able to do these things, it is also deemed irrelevant whether they are fit to conduct a Sunday-school or a concert garden; whether they are able to earn a living in business or only capable of adorning a street corner or a rum-shop. Nor is the fact either that they are powerful in prayer and exhortation, or are strong at the whiskey bottle, any objection to their eligibility to office, so long as they do what is required and serve faithfully their masters.

Since when we want a man to build a house we do not care whether or not he is able to paint a portrait, and when we need a shoemaker we do not inquire if he can play the piano, it might be thought that this specialization of function would be wholly a good thing. So it is, no doubt, as we have argued, but still within limits. If nothing else be thought of, however, a time comes when we are startled to discover where we are. The Alpine tourist who takes that smooth and grassy path down the mountain is sometimes appalled at finding that he is on the brink of a precipice. To save himself, his full energies are required. So, under all circumstances, it is often the case that though the direct path be enticing, the longest way round is the shortest way home.

The ancient Hebrews, in their rude and barbarous way, fashioned certain rules of conduct

which they believed emanated from a supreme and divine Source of all law. Among these was the injunction, "Thou shalt not steal." This somehow, for many centuries, has been adopted as an excellent, thoroughly practical, and very satisfactory rule to govern conduct. It has been reserved for commercial enterprise to discover that it is altogether too theoretical.

So, if we consider ordinary practices in the business community, there seems to be need of a revision of the Decalogue, striking out here and there a commandment, or modifying some of them, as the eighth, so as to make it less universal and to exclude certain classes from its operation. Or, better, perhaps, abolish the whole scheme as antiquated and obsolete. Then the Sunday-school superintendent will no longer be embarrassed to explain his conduct when on Sunday he solemnly reads to his pupils the injunction, "Thou shalt not steal," and on Monday he meets his honored friend, the defaulter or the public robber, on the street, grasps his hand warmly and beams upon him admiringly, and even lends him his pocket-book for political disbursements. Then, too, what a relief it will be for all of us to be able to recommend frankly, and with the innocence of Eden, Mr. So-and-so to Mme. Grande Dame at a reception, with words of compliment like these : "He



is such a polished and charming man, and, you know, he is such an accomplished thief." Thus we might go on; after having struck out all the "nots" from the commandments, lest they be homeless and useless, we might as well put them into the beatitudes: "Blessed are those who are *not* meek;" "Blessed are they that are *not* merciful;" "Blessed are they that are *not* poor in spirit;" "Blessed are they that do *not* hunger and thirst after righteousness." Thus renovated, the commandments and the beatitudes would become truly practical to the minds of those who are educated to believe that "every man for himself" furnishes a complete and satisfying rule of conduct.

We cannot deny that in the eyes of the civilized world one of the most characteristic American traits is venality. Our enterprise, our progressiveness, is recognized, but the taint of corruption is attached. The almost inevitable outcome of venality and aggressive competition is dishonesty. And we should not disguise from ourselves that this accusation is in some measure true. Corruption is in the atmosphere and in the act. I remember my admiration, and also my mortification for my own country, over an incident which occurred during my first visit to England fourteen years ago. A corporation was

seeking a franchise to build a bridge over the Thames near the Tower of London. The customary hearing was in progress before a committee of the House of Commons, with counsel for the the petitioners and the opponents. One morning lawyers for those seeking the franchise handed to their adversaries a letter their clients had received offering for suitable recompense to secure a favorable report from the committee. A great scandal was created by what is an ordinary occurrence in our own land. Investigation followed, the writers of the letter were found out, brought to the bar of the House of Commons, and imprisoned for contempt. I could not help but wonder how many attorneys at Albany or Washington had received such letters; how many had answered them; how many had paid the bribe; moreover, how many had been approached by legislators themselves offering to sell their influence and vote. I have heard of many such; but I never yet have learned of one who considered it his duty to initiate the prosecution of a person who offered to secure the ends desired by his clients through meretricious influence. The most I have known a lawyer to do is to decline the offered aid. Fortunately this is by no means uncommon. Unfortunately the acceptance is perhaps more common. If anything is to be done, money is

required. This our business men understand perfectly, and if they want anything they expect to pay for it. What they desire is results; the intermediate steps they care nothing about, nor will they make inquiry. Then if it happen that through the wickedness of men bribery is accomplished, there is left the opportunity of being terribly surprised and shocked.

The absence of that keen sense of honor exemplified in the English bribery case just spoken of, and the presence of a callousness to moral obligation which indicates a serious depravation of character, occur in some things and in some persons where the incongruity is very startling. We all know the disgraceful position the United States held for a long time with regard to international copyright, and we all know how universally the sentiment still obtains that with respect to foreign books stealing is no robbery. But, as just said, we have reached the point where theft seems somehow incongruous. The Sunday-school superintendent may indeed be the ally of the public robber and not himself be a thief. Yet if, for instance, the superintendent and the pastor of his church were to unite in a scheme for robbing foreign authors and publishers, however natural it might appear on close analysis, it still seems incongruous—not altogether in accordance with the fit-

ness of things, not *convenable*, not quite in good form. But not long ago we could have found a clergyman, at the head of a convocation of churches belonging to a numerous and prominent religious denomination, endeavoring to get the ministers of his faith to join him in the theft of an English work on Egypt, the book being, in his opinion, too dear in its original form for the most of religious people. So, also, we might have noticed a firm publishing exclusively religious books, as the official representatives of a great denomination, proposing to steal an English edition of the Bible, containing, as they tell us, about fifty-six thousand references, indexes, maps, a glossary and dictionary, and a large number of learned illustrative articles, which cost the owner a large amount of money! Very pertinent is the remark of a daily journal upon this transaction: "Fancy the diffusion of religious ideas through the medium of stolen Bibles sold by religious teachers." "How like it is to that story of the negro revival meeting in one end of a barn, while water was boiling in the other to scald a stolen hog!" Again, and to cap the climax, we beheld a doctor of divinity, minister of that gospel which adds more severe imperatives of duty to the Ten Commandments, a conductor of religious periodicals, not only leading in a monumental piratical enterprise, but also

claiming that, in self-protection, stealing first, and then, if one feels like it, paying over what he pleases as conscience money, is "the nearest approach practicable to an equitable working plan, until our nation has recovered from its collapse of conscience on the international copyright question!" The serious side of all this is apt to escape us, and we are moved to exclaim, as did the Western farmer when, on his return from a journey, he found his house, his barn, his wife, his children, and his well-sweep whirled to destruction by a cyclone—"This is too ridiculous!"

Noticing things like these we have just been instancing, occurring among a class of people who might be supposed to have the highest sense of honor, and considering the general venality and low-principled methods of action in all classes, thoughtful men cannot help asking, Whither do all these things tend? Can we hope for a better order? Are we going from bad to worse? If not, what encouraging signs are there? And what will be the final outcome? Of course, these eager queries cannot be answered with certainty, and how they are answered in any wise will depend largely upon the optimistic or pessimistic character of the one answering. But optimism is much more natural than pessimism in a democracy. This very fact is a most significant and

encouraging one. It indicates that the sources of life have not yet been drained. So long as the social condition is such that the natural initiative of man's energy has free scope, progress will continue. And this is the advantage of a democratic country like our own, that it does give this freedom for spontaneous action, unhindered save by the necessities of the common freedom. If this shall always be so, we are safe.

A great many men of what we are accustomed to call "the older school" in politics are apt to take a much darker view. The last-published volume of James Russell Lowell's poems\* is prefaced by these lines :

"Along the wayside where we pass bloom few  
Gay plants of heartsease, more of saddening rue ;  
So life is mingled."

In the utterances that follow this inscription, and in almost all the expressions of the poet's mind during the latest part of his life, there is evident such a disapproval of present social and political conditions, such a discouragement of mind, that his spirit seems to have entered some abode of gloom before the doors of which he had been commanded to leave hope behind. In one of great faith, whose disposition was cheery and

---

\* "Heartsease and Rue."

voice strong, over whose country the sun was always rising, never setting, until these last years, a change so evident, even though partially concealed by effort, and fought against, as shown by occasional outbursts, is extremely significant. It is brought home to our thought with many a query, now that so remarkable a man, eminent both as a political thinker and an active patriot, has gone to his final rest.

With the failing energies of approaching old age conservatism is usual enough, but generally it is rather optimistic than the reverse. The things which are, seem sufficient ; and if it appear hopeless to effect change, the thought is quick to spring up that change itself would be useless or worse. With finer and more reflective minds, however, whose ideals are set high, and in comparison with which all things actual appear mean and contemptible, a keen appreciation of how much better things might be is accompanied by a great despair at one's impotence to improve them. The fruitless striving to do something, or at least to point out the way, baffled as it ordinarily is, in itself intensifies the feeling that matters are at their worst, or, if not, that ruin is close and inevitable. Of the latter sort, no doubt, was the soul-weariness of him who fought so well in the good fight against slavery, who maintained in such

sensible and graceful words the excellence of the democratic theory of government at Birmingham in 1884, and who in 1887 writes to Curtis :

"I mount no longer when the trumpets call ;  
My battle-harness idles on the wall,  
The spider's castle, camping ground of dust,  
Not without dints, and all in front, I trust.  
Shivering sometimes, it calls me as it hears  
Afar the charge's tramp and clash of spears ;  
But 'tis such murmur as might be  
The sea-shell's lost tradition of the sea."

We must not forget that the poets always have been soothsayers and seers. They are our prophets both of good and evil, sentries quick to give the alarm when their acute senses apprehend danger. They should always be listened to and sought, at least for omens. They are good barometers to foretell tempests, even though they cannot predict the extent, the duration, or the destructiveness of the atmospheric commotion ; and even if telegraphic communication from a hundred different points is more extensively useful, we must also know the local atmospheres in order to get the data for our generalizations.

But there is a broader vision, to which the eyes of men like Mr. Lowell seem to have been closed—a vision wherein the evil becomes dwarfed in a widening and intensified stability, under the struc-



tural bands of which is accumulating a power unfailing and sure to give forth all good things. If politics has become a matter of barter and trade, if office be but the spoils of the victor, if the best men eschew political life, if wealth and leisure concern themselves little with the affairs of the nation, if the Astors "have no political interests in New York"—this condition of things is not symptomatic of mortal disease. It is measles and not the plague. It seems to me that to the careful observer it must appear that every day the social organism is on the whole becoming more solidified, and the power of disintegrating forces is growing less. The fact that so much is endured that is seen to be bad, and endured without materially affecting the general happiness and prosperity, is the strongest kind of proof of the truth of these statements. Nor can we explain the apathy and *laissez-faire* of so many of the best citizens in regard to the movements of politics wholly on the theory of the hopeless and ruinous depravity they find therein. Supposing they do find it, they would not be prevented from interfering if their liberty or their property were seriously endangered. When great peril is scented, how quickly people of this class of voters bestir themselves! But they have come to see the truth that, in America at least, the perfection of

government is no longer an index of the strength of the organism. It is becoming less indispensable as the general level of intelligence and character rises; and that such level is continually rising admits of no doubt. If, then, people speak little and seem to care less about "loyalty" and "patriotism," the watchwords of a past generation, it is at the present in America not wholly a sign of decadence, but rather evinces an evolutionary movement onward to the point where government is superseded by the harmonious self-rule of individuals. We are sometimes told that the politicians are our rulers. I should rather say they are makers of officials who are servants, not masters; bad servants, it may be true, but still undeniably servants. As the soldier in this country has become merely a policeman, so the public officer has become a *dienstmann* or *commissionaire*. No fault should be found with this in itself. The trouble lies in the fact that too often he is the servant, not of the whole, as he should be, but only of a few, who control his actions for their advantage and emolument, though all contribute to pay him.

The presence of anarchical manifestations, therefore, need not discourage or alarm us. As our contention is, they are the natural outcome of the notion of individual liberty for which the

forefathers struggled. The very theory of the right to suffrage, which has been so much urged and insisted upon, easily becomes in the minds even of some intelligent persons a justification for corrupt dealing. For if the right to vote belongs to a man because he is a man, it is his property, and hence he may sell it as anything else which is his own. He does not reflect that though suffrage be universal the right is a qualified one, like that of eminent domain in a corporation, subject to the condition that it shall be exercised always and only for a public use. This, however, is a matter of education; and we do not wait for education before conferring the right. If we are consistent in our belief in democratic institutions, we shall not begrudge the ignorant or reckless man the ballot, though he sometimes use it improperly. Nor should we be very much disturbed if men of a class we consider lower than ourselves be elected to office. The constituency must always be considered. The best the conditions allow is what should be sought and all we can get; and if this is not very good, we must possess our souls in patience till the schoolmaster "gets in his fine work," even if we have to wait for a younger generation to come upon the stage. For argument is of very little use with the adult mind. It generally is a waste of time and energy

for a person to set about convincing an adversary by elaborate reasoning, still less by satire or repartee. It reminds one of Father Tom's attempts to "catapomphericate" the pope, and is apt to end as did his controversy, with some offensive malediction, either expressed or suppressed. Conviction is accomplished best by that which merely suggests and sets the mind in motion, allaying instead of generating antagonism, appealing to the sympathies and guiding without seeming to do so. People are ruled by their sentiments, which create, perhaps unconsciously, their opinions, and which are made up by their interests, their traditions, their personal likes and dislikes, mingled in measures that differ comparatively with each new individual, and are extremely difficult to estimate or understand. But their minds are not inactive, and the educating process goes on the more rapidly the more material comfort increases. The masses of the people appreciate that violence destroys the chance of obtaining those things which they have come to believe of the most value to themselves. And while it is true that the greatest evil at present is what Mr. Herbert Spencer calls "a militant industrialism," its excesses and evils will be abated by the very condition of freedom which has produced them. I find a pertinent statement on this point in the

second volume of the "Principles of Ethics," just published : \* " Our existing social *régime*, with its vast amounts of property in relatively few hands, though a *régime* appropriate to the existing type of humanity, and probably essential to it, is one which we may rightly regard as transitional. Just as modern times have seen a decrease in those great political inequalities, and accompanying inequalities of power, which characterized earlier times ; so future times will most likely see a decrease in those great pecuniary inequalities which now prevail. Having emerged from the militant social type, we appear to be passing through a social type which may be distinguished as militant industrialism—an industrialism which, though carried on under the system of contract, instead of under the system of status, is in a considerable measure carried on in the old militant spirit ; as indeed it could not fail to be, seeing that men's characters and sentiments can be changed only in the course of long ages. Though pecuniary inequalities—some of them perhaps not inconsiderable—may be expected to characterize the future, reasserting themselves after socialisms and communisms have temporarily triumphed ; yet we may infer that under higher social forms and a better

---

\* P. 348.

type of humanity they will be nothing like so marked as now." x

It may then be claimed with good reason that the degradation of law and disrespect for government will not land us in a condition of militant anarchy, wherein bloodshed and ruin will prevail as in the old times, but in a stable order, in which anarchy, in the sense of absence of government, or the minimum of government, will be the characteristic feature. If democracy be ultimately successful and work out its own theory perfectly, this will surely be the finality.

When the domination of monarchy and aristocracy is overthrown, there is confusion and disorder from the removal of restraint, sometimes issuing in the most dreadful crimes and tremendous catastrophes. But if it be true, and I think it is, that the cure for the evils of liberty is more liberty, the need of individual security after a little while becomes paramount, even in the minds of people having only a moderate amount of intelligence. Hence is produced a restraint upon conduct more and more effective as affairs settle themselves. Then, if the idea of the common liberty becomes thoroughly pervasive, the necessity for government grows less. As society improves, public functions become of inferior importance, and if the ideal involved in the true ✓

conception of democracy ever be realized, government will disappear altogether. The celestial city will neither need nor have any policemen or jails.

But though in a society founded upon the principle of individual liberty the reverence for kings and princes becomes extinguished, the notion of "inherent sacredness" in any institution is dissipated, and even the sentiment of loyalty, so powerful in monarchical countries, abates to a very noticeable extent; yet, with the advance of civilization and the increase of material prosperity, we have been forced to notice that the sense of the value of combination and concentration is more strongly developed. The future employment of governmental power for purposes of public convenience hence suggests itself in a thousand ways, the extent of which readers of Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward" will easily picture. Various forms of socialism are everywhere securing popularity, and there are many who would make the government, which was once a kingship hedged about with divinity, a universal pack-horse to carry everybody's burdens, or a mill to grind every man's grist, if not also a granary to supply him with corn. In a highly interesting and indeed remarkable work, just published, entitled, "National

Life and Character: A Forecast,"\* Mr. Charles H. Pearson expresses the belief that some form of state socialism is the prevailing destiny of the civilized nations. He argues from somewhat the same premises as those expressed in the earlier chapters of this essay. Furthermore, he endeavors to show that civilization is making no headway, and can make no permanent headway, against the increase in numbers and material strength of the inferior peoples—Mongolians and Africans especially. That, when the impact of civilized energy has exhausted itself and met with inevitable check from these lower races, it will be thrown back upon itself, and progress will tend to become stationary, individual life will become aimless, spontaneity will abate, and the burden thrown upon the state to take care of its citizens—in short, that at length invincible natural conditions will create a despotism of social causes, which will reduce existence for the mass of the people to the same degree of hopelessness as under the worst tyranny of absolute monarchy. The writer does not apply his conclusions in terms to America, and some distinctions he draws here and there, with reference to the United States, would seem to indicate that he would hes-

---

\* Macmillan & Co., 1893.



itate to do so. To me, at least, it does not seem as within the range of probabilities that a country which has grown up under the education of universal manhood suffrage ever can be ruled by the methods of state socialism. The ballot fosters individualism; and though, as a reaction from the separatism of individual liberty, combination and organization for all sorts of purposes, political and other, have been prevalent and been carried to a high degree of perfection, the ballot is still an efficacious solvent. The power of combinations is everywhere watched with a jealous eye. It is met, indeed, by counter-combination; but this shows the disposition to reduce too great an accumulation of strength, wherever it occurs. And the same disintegrative action, which now operates in the direction of producing equality of power, would be put forth with tenfold the force against any enlarged and comprehensive scheme to use government for purposes of positive beneficence. Doubtless, legislation to check the influence of great corporations, and to relieve against monopoly, suggests the expediency of the government superseding such organizations, in itself assuming the work they do for the community. Very likely, too, the scope of governmental administration may be enlarged, so as to include some of these offices. The government owner-

ship of railroads, for instance, has been found , beneficial in some countries, though chiefly for military purposes. But regulation is one thing, ownership another; and there is as yet no indication of any public sentiment in the United States which would allow of the latter. Wherever movements have been made along socialistic lines, the experiment has been abandoned, the tide of public feeling sooner or later setting decidedly against it. I repeat, then, so long as each man has one voice and vote, any extended plan of socialistic government cannot be established, and could not be maintained if it were. And abridging the right of suffrage is the last thing any intelligent student of American life, social and political, would venture to predict as likely to occur.

Our conclusions are, that we should not lose faith in the democratic idea as the most efficacious for human progress and the welfare of the human race. We should continue to act under its inspiration in the direction of the equalization of material and social conditions. For security of the individual there must be equality of rights; for equality of rights there must be equality of power. Movements to do away with inequalities, of wealth especially, as the chief source of power in a democracy, are all the while going on. But the chief desideratum is the improvement of

character by restoring the sense of duty. One would think the clergy would be of the most use of any class in this work; yet it is a question if they are not as much of a hindrance as a help. Their blind and obstinate insistence on utterly worn-out and valueless dogmas, their childish contentions about heresies, their unchristian and savage attacks upon each other, their inability to learn anything from observation of their own times, make them generally—with, however, conspicuous and noble exceptions—worthless either to declare what morality is or to persuade men to practise it. But it must be taught, nevertheless, as a matter of practical consequence—a charity which begins at home and is never out of place abroad.

From the foregoing observations, the true political philosophy would seem to be to maintain as an ideal a state wherein there is no government whatever; and to the end of its realization to curtail and restrict the operations of government wherever and whenever possible, instead of seeking to enlarge its functions. For my own part, I believe the lines of practical effort at present to lie in the direction of abolishing, as fast as it is safe to do so, all legislation for the benefit of particular individuals or classes of persons; to reduce, to its minimum, state or municipal interference

with personal liberty; and to insist with increasing stringency that officials are public servants, to be held to the same standards of duty as any private employee to his employer. It is a most encouraging sign of the times, that the last is becoming more and more required, and there is abundant reason to believe that it will be still more stringently demanded.

Beyond all these things and like reforms is the supreme importance of educating character. I say supreme importance, not because it relates to any special emergency, not because it protects any particular industry, not because it corrects any one preëminently flagrant abuse, but because it furnishes the force for all emergencies, the protection for all industries, the corrective for all abuses. This is true not only because a self-controlled and self-regulated character in the citizen is the best security for the permanence of any form of government, but also because it is the sole condition upon which human beings can dwell together in society at all. In whatever degree it exists there is a social order, and exactly in the proportion that it is well developed is there such a thing as a successful community or nationality. In his address on "Democracy," Mr. Lowell summed it up when he concluded: "Our healing is not in the storm or in the whirlwind, it is not in monarchies,

or aristocracies, or democracies, but will be revealed by the still small voice that speaks to the conscience and the heart, prompting us to a wider and wiser humanity."

This voice will not be made to speak through the reading of one of Daniel Webster's orations, or the Declaration of Independence, or even a chapter in the Bible. And it is only he that hath ears to hear who hears. There must be in the disposition of the man himself something which responds to the calls of patriotic duty. This is alone found where it has been grown by processes of planting and watering, and where the weeds threatening to choke it have been kept down. Such a work of cultivation has, of course, been going on through our national history, else we never would have prospered. But as our empire becomes vaster, our population more heterogeneous, there is need of enlarged effort and of extending the sphere of operation in every new direction that presents itself. More especially is this true at a time like the present, when the bonds of authority are everywhere loosening, when government seems to be weakening, when the restraints of religion are of diminished force, and when anarchical manifestations are displaying themselves before we seem ready for them. In such a situation, to cure the evils arising and threatened, the education, not of

intellect merely, but of character, is the only complete and effective remedy, in comparison with which even the best political measures that can be devised are merely palliatives.

The wisest teachers from the most ancient times to the present, whether Asiatic or European, Jew, Greek, Buddhist, or Christian, have understood and declared with emphasis the doctrine that the kingdom of God is within us. This truth we are everywhere forgetting to-day. The biblical expression is not the formula of a particular religious creed, but the statement of a universal fact of human nature. That satisfaction which every one craves in life is never found in his external possessions, but in the accumulation within himself of a fund of contentment. Not what he has, but what he is, makes his happiness. To be sure, what he has may contribute powerfully to his enjoyment, if he knows how to value it and use it aright; but unless he does, it fails to bring the peace entirely feasible for his neighbor to secure who has none of this world's goods at all.

I am by no means sure that one may not derive more happiness from life by doing nothing whatever, than from any form of activity; but his environment must be favorable. Climate has a great influence upon the characters of people; and in Africa and India, for example, where lazy-

ness is the fashion, and rather necessitated, I should not wonder if the vegetative life, with no property interests—not even clothes—were happier than the bustling, worrying existence of more advanced civilizations. Sir Edwin Arnold seems to like it better than managing a newspaper ; and I think most of us would, too! When I read the “Light of Asia,” the Indian sacred writings, the Zend-Avesta, Omar Khayyam, Confucius, or even the sayings of Socrates in Plato, I feel more inclined to believe in lotus-eating, and in the sitting-around-and-harp-playing notion of heaven which has been so much disparaged. When, however, we find inaction carried as far as it is in China, where people lolling on the bank of a river will see a person drown before their eyes without making any effort to rescue him, we are rather inclined to revert with a sense of relief to the vanities and venalities of the Occident.

But if in our day and generation and environment we are condemned to toilsome activity, one or two things are certain. Our lives must conform to a standard of excellence within us, quite irrespective of our prominence in the eyes of others, else we shall be gnawed with discontent to the last hour. If we do not esteem it better to deserve success than to obtain it, we shall always find something lacking. It is the anxiety to give

full value, instead of eighty cents' worth or less, for a dollar, that makes the man, and "want of it the fellow." It is the sense that he is doing his very best upon anything on which he tries his hand that alone satisfies. Under a devil-take-the-hind-most policy there is no time to be thorough. The wit expended in getting ahead of the other man is often sufficient, if properly applied, to make a true master of the art. And a real master knows that the only superiority in any wise secure and worth having is that which, spite of jealousy and competition, commands success because of supreme excellence.

It is a painful spectacle in connection with the agitation of labor against capital, to observe how laboring men become so intent upon their rights as to be unmindful of their duties. It seems almost impossible to get honest, whole-hearted, full-measured work done in these days. Everything is given grudgingly; not a moment of extra time is accorded, not a stroke of extra labor. If the plumber be called and the driving of a nail is needed, it is the carpenter's business, not his. Unless the utmost care is taken, everything is scanted in time, labor, and material. The old idea of doing "a good job" is subordinated to the demands of labor politics. Is this what our public orators mean when they talk about "the nobility of labor"?



If such charges as these be brought against the workingman, he may indeed retort against the capitalists and wage-givers that they are always grinding the face of the poor. However just the claim may be, it is no justification for the wage-earner to regard his employer as an enemy, to beat anything out of whom is a merit. But oppression of capital, no doubt, is largely responsible for the laborer's discontent; therefore it is well that the capitalist be made to feel this and be induced to make concessions and practise humanity toward those who are weaker than himself, and who are at all times the bond-slaves of poverty. It is quite impossible to attach all blame to the one side and all innocence to the other. The only thing to be done is to repress and condemn the wrong spirit wherever it exists, whether in plutocrat or knight of labor.

As our country grows older, we shall find the true meaning of the inculcation of patriotism to be not so much inspiring youth with devotion to the American flag and American forms of government as inherently admirable and superior to all others, as in teaching the necessity of a more perfect understanding of and adaptation to the conditions of social life in general. In this way only can the end and aim of democracy—to secure the individual man from the domination

and oppression of his fellow—be accomplished. There can be no such adaptation until it is appreciated that not only the nobility but the success of labor, high or low, consists in the mastery which of itself distances competition, and not in exercises of activity to push beyond others, or circumventing them through trick and device. A recent journalistic writer has well expressed this truth in saying,\* “The man who forgets most completely his own vanity, and in a sense his own interest in the accomplishment of his work, and identifies himself with the work, secures in the end the very highest personal returns from that work, because by his very self-abnegation he makes himself a master of his craft.” This doctrine must be more strongly insisted on. It is a thoughtless and dangerous way of teaching, to tell boys in school, as instructors often do, that any one of them can become President of the United States if he will only resolve to “get there,” one man in this favored country being as good as another. This is dreadful heresy. It never has been nor ever will be true. Though all men in America have in theory equality of protection and security, they are not equal, and never should expect to be regarded as equal.

---

\* *The Christian Union*, Sept. 12, 1891: “A Test of Criticism.”

Youth should be taught that their power and happiness depend not on office, but on what they themselves are, and are able to do better than others in anything within their immediate sphere of opportunity, even if it be only boot-blackening. It should not be their design to enter one employment with the idea of unfaithfully using their opportunities merely as a stepping-stone to some other while neglecting their duties; but rather to rise from it, if at all, irrepressibly and irresistibly, by reason of a force accumulated through conspicuous fidelity and skill in the labor of the lower station. If this be done, no position is "low"; without it, nothing is high.

To this idea of the loss of self in one's work there needs to be added another element for that personal character required in the ideal citizen. The kinship between art and morals is much closer than often supposed. The great artist, indeed, is a glory to humanity when, by his devotion of mind and hand to the object before him, forgetting self, intent only on perfecting the product of his genius, he introduces into the world some immortal creation to delight the senses and inspire the souls of men. In this he truly serves humanity. If now the impulses of art are clothed on with a spirit which finds its true purpose in that loss of self whose object is not some material

symbolical creation on canvas or in marble, in music or in poetry, but whose end is the welfare of human personality itself, wherein nature and art blend, we have exactly the character which the social state demands, and the only one with which it can rest satisfied.

I do not advance this as a religious precept, but as a universal principle deeper than any particular religion, because it lies in the constitution of human nature itself. It is a conclusion of psychological, anthropological, and historical science, and it surely is not injured thereby if it also be a teaching of religion. In fact, it affords the ground of reconciliation of science and religion wherever there may be antagonism between the two. The social state of mankind is patent. Human beings dwell in society, be it more or less extensive; be it family, town, tribe, state, nation; and within the community limits, however small the circle, there must be that self-abnegation wherein the individual finds his happiness in the happiness of others. The wider the sphere, the more complete the sentiment, the larger the society thereby created. Only as the altruistic disposition grows in extent or intensity, does the common liberty become more perfect; and as it wanes, tyranny, autocracy, and the rule of force increase. But the effect of civilization and the

annihilation of distance has been to create a necessity for the mutual aid and comfort derived from the social order, on the part of families with families, villages with villages, cities with cities, states with states, and nations with nations. The tendency of this is to destroy the barriers separating nationalities, to break down old monarchical and aristocratic institutions, and to establish in power what is called the will of the people. It does not require any uncommon prophetic gifts to discern, then, that the whole civilized world, at any rate, with frequent additions from the uncivilized, is daily coming more completely within the requirements of the ideal community comprised in the demand that each individual shall be at once the means and the end of all the rest. This is the recognition of the intrinsic value of human personality, the security for all the fundamental rights of man. How important, in view of this, appears the formation and perfection everywhere of that character of the citizen which it has been our aim to describe, which is the only sure guarantee of liberty, order, material and intellectual progress, and all the blessings of civilized life!

To epitomize the thought I have endeavored to convey in this chapter: The ideal of the perfection of democracy as a form of government

merges in that of a situation where there is no government at all. Depreciation in the importance of governmental functions does not necessarily indicate danger of social disorder and loss of liberty. In the United States, conditions are such that the prevailing apathy of large numbers of the most intelligent people regarding politics, and the consequent low standard of political action and administration, is symptomatic of an evolutionary movement of progress toward a point where government will cease because unnecessary. If this be so, the course to be pursued is not to multiply but to diminish as far as possible the activities of government, to limit its sphere, to reduce its functions, insisting all the while that a public officer is an agent and a servant, to be held accountable as such to his employers—all who pay for his services, not a part or a few of them, or those who do not pay at all. In furtherance of this policy we must not rely mainly on legislation. It is supremely important to secure in every direction a complete and thorough education of character. This consists in establishing as a controlling sentiment the knowledge that the source of human happiness is within, not in outward circumstances; that such happiness can be obtained not by what one gets, but through what he is; that self-forgetful devo-

tion to whatever a man's hand finds to do is the secret of success, and that the disposition from which a person finds his pleasure and good in the welfare and pleasure of others is the only self-satisfying condition of life, the only substantial guarantee of peace and order in the community.

Thus, because man is so made and the world so constituted, it is universally true that not only he who is willing to be a good citizen and wishes his neighbors to be, but he who desires to get out of life the best there is in it, must so act that he can sincerely and truthfully say:

" Mine be the love that in itself can find  
Seed of white thoughts, the lilies of the mind—  
Seed of that glad surrender of the will  
That finds in service self's true purpose still." \*

---

\* Lowell: "Endymion."

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

---

### A SYSTEM OF PSYCHOLOGY.

BY DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

2 vols., 8vo, 1226 pages.

---

*The Leeds (England) Mercury.*

This is a very comprehensive and important work.

*The Journal of Mental Science (England).*

Mr. Thompson's work accomplishes its aim in a very successful manner. The book may without hesitation be pronounced a good one.

*The Edinburgh Scotsman.*

In the seventy-five chapters of these bulky volumes a more detailed and systematic account is given of the genesis and development of states of consciousness than can be found in any other single work in the language.

Mr. Thompson is an accomplished and earnest searcher after truth.

*The N. Y. Popular Science Monthly.*

It is undoubtedly the most important contribution to psychological science that any American has yet produced; nor is there any foreign work with which we are acquainted that contains so exhaustive, so instructive, and well presented a digest of the subject as this.

*The Academy (England).*

Mr. Thompson's treatise, though named *A System of Psychology*, is in reality, in outline at least, a system of philosophy.

While following the most plainly marked track in the fields of English thought, Mr. Thompson is independent, and now and again impressively original.

*The Contemporary Review (England).*

Mr. Thompson is an acute and careful observer himself, and a systematic student of the results put forward by other workers.

The author has amply made good the modest claim he puts forward for himself as an independent student.—A. SMITH.



*Mind (England).*

The passages that have been referred to must, of course, be taken merely as specimens of Mr. Thompson's contributions to psychology, not as a complete account of all that he has done; but they are sufficient to show that if he has not systematized the science from any new point of view, he has at least carried the analytical methods of the older psychology further in various directions.

*Nature (England).*

In criticising any new book, we ought to ask whether the author has made any advance on his immediate predecessors. We ought, in fact, to apply to the particular author we are criticising the test of progress to which psychology as a whole may be submitted. Mr. Thompson's book will emerge successfully from an examination such as that which is here suggested. In dealing with many special questions he goes beyond the later English psychologists, just as they themselves have gone beyond Locke.

We may conclude by saying that, although in some respects an unequal book, it is decidedly an important contribution of America to the treatment of psychology on the lines with which English readers are most familiar.

*The Index (Boston, Mass.).*

It is recognized as a standard work at once. (*First notice.*)

This work proves the author to be a man of large intellectual grasp, of keen critical and analytical ability, and at the same time of large constructive power and capacity for generalization, of ample acquaintance with philosophy and literature.

One need not assent to all that Mr. Thompson advances in order to appreciate his robust thought, his masterly reasoning, his clear, strong style and truly philosophic spirit. (*Second notice.*)

It is without doubt the most profound, extensive, and original work on psychology that this country has produced. (*Third notice.*)

*Revue Philosophique (Paris).*

We consider that Mr. Thompson has rendered a great service to psychologists in undertaking to systematize results actually attained; he has succeeded in presenting them in clear and precise form; he has in many places added useful information, and the reading of his work is eminently suggestive. It seems to us, above all, that he has the great merit of producing a work almost entirely psychological.—F. PICAVET.

## THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

BY DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

8vo., 281 pages.

---

*The Journal of Education (England).*

Mr. Thompson has already made a name for himself as a psychologist, and he handles the questions of moral science with an acuteness which will sustain his reputation.

*The N. Y. Popular Science Monthly.*

A multitude of the pressing problems of our social life are suggested and discussed in this compact volume with such frankness, sincerity, ability, and good feeling that we can heartily commend it not only to the professional scholar, but to all thoughtful men and women.

*The Open Court (Chicago, Ill.).*

The style of our author is admirably clear, and the general tone of the discussion, covering, as it does, a wide range of practical questions which are uppermost in the thought of millions at the present day, will doubtless secure for Mr. Thompson's book a wide circle of intelligent readers.

*The Guardian (England).*

We admire his [*the author's*] originality and analytical power, his obvious desire to be true to facts, his almost omnivorous tastes in literature, and, above all, his extreme modesty and self-effacement. Even when we come to the end and remember that we disagree with his first principles, there remains with us a consciousness of much that is true and some things which are new, while in lucidity of exposition and fearlessness of statement Mr. Thompson reminds us more of John Stuart Mill than of any other of his chosen leaders.

*Knowledge (England).*

Mr. Thompson, in the very able and important work before us, investigates the nature and origin of evil, and essays to point out the most hopeful means for its elimination. . . . He discusses at length the suggested methods (social, political, and ecclesiastical) for reducing evil to a minimum, which have been and are still advanced, and shows trenchantly the fallacies which underlie them all. . . . We will not diminish the pleasure with which the reader will peruse this volume, by any more detailed analysis of its contents; suffice it to say that Mr. Thompson has made a real and enduring contribution to ethical philosophy.

## THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF THE HUMAN MIND.

BY DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

8vo, 184 pages.

---

*The Popular Science Monthly (New York).*

In the volume before us Mr. Thompson has entered upon a fruitful field of thought and discussion; one, moreover, which requires great tact and delicacy in its cultivation, if the author would secure the sympathetic and respectful attention of his readers. In this respect, Mr. Thompson has been notably successful. His treatment of his topic is calm, temperate, philosophical, free from bias, appealing to reason rather than to theological or anti-theological prejudices. While his discussion of the religious problem is entirely frank, manly, and unconventional, it is also duly considerate of those conceptions which he is compelled to discredit and oppose. . . . The book, as a whole, stimulates thought and holds the attention of the reader. In connection with "A System of Psychology" and "The Problem of Evil," it justifies us in ranking its author among our ablest philosophical thinkers.

*The Manchester (England) Examiner.*

Readers of the more thoughtful type who are acquainted with Mr. Daniel Greenleaf Thompson's "System of Psychology," and his very suggestive treatment of "The Problem of Evil," will extend a hearty welcome to his new work. . . . Though his work cannot be compared with the recent magnificent contribution to the literature of the same great theme by Dr. James Martineau, it is full of acute, sound, and penetrating thought. Of the four sections into which the book is divided, perhaps the second . . . is the richest in interest; but the work, from first to last, is well worthy of careful study.

*Mind.*

Mr. Thompson's present work is a study of the science, not of *religions* as they exist or have existed, but of *religion* as a general fact of conscious experience. His aim is rather to determine what beliefs can rationally be held about the supernatural than to describe the process by which the supernatural comes to be believed in; though, in accordance with his traditional view of philosophic method, he makes an investigation of this preliminary to his determination of the limits of rational belief, and more generally bases his religious philosophy on his previous work in psychology and ethics.

## SOCIAL PROGRESS.

BY DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

8vo, 182 pages.

*New York Times.*

There is a matter of exceeding interest to be found in this volume, which is a cool and dispassionate analysis of human actions.

*Boston Transcript.*

The book is full of meat for thoughtful readers. . . . We commend it to the reading of every man who wishes to see the way clearer to political and social reform in our own country.

*Edinburgh Scotsman.*

An admirable, clear, and logical exposition of those principles which are now generally recognized as the essential conditions of national and individual well being.

*Science.*

The author's style is clear and flowing, so that the book is easy and agreeable to read; and there is much in it that thinkers of all schools will agree with.

*The Epoch.*

Mr. Thompson shows great analytical power, clearness of statement, moderateness of view, and frequently originality. This book might well be read by every American citizen, for even old thoughts are put in a forcible, and often original, way.

*The Christian Union.*

The best part of Mr. Thompson's book is that in which he discusses moral and religious ideas. He urges the duty of intellectual hospitality, and himself recognizes it in his treatment of Christian ideas which he does not accept. He urges upon Christian people a willingness to let those who differ with them in faith unite with them in good works, reminding them of the Scripture teaching that those who "do the will" shall "know the doctrine.

*American Hebrew.*

An important and valuable contribution to political science. He evinces a masterly logical equipment. His education of the principles of liberty and equality is certainly to be classed with the very best specimens of close reasoning upon abstract subjects. Mr. Thompson has contributed a worthy addition to the literature of philosophical thought; his speculative genius is profound and broad enough to give him high rank not only among the few elect thinkers in America, but among the acutest metaphysicians of our time.

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF FICTION IN LITERATURE.

BY DANIEL GREENLEAF THOMPSON.

12mo, 226 pages.

---

*Scottish Leader.*

A thoughtful and conscientious attempt to state a theory of the novel.

*Sheffield and Rotherheim Independent (England).*

A book which cannot fail to attract and edify.

*London Times.*

Those who like reading books about books will find much to interest and instruct them.

*Sunday Times (England).*

The author knows his subject exceedingly well, and many of his criticisms are just and luminous.

*National Observer (England).*

The book is short, but it contains not only nearly all there was to be said about fiction as a fine art, but perhaps most of the good things about it which were worth repeating.

*The Scotsman (Edinburgh).*

The essay displays the same ability as is shown in this writer's contributions to psychology and ethical philosophy.

*The Academy (England).*

His criticisms of M. Zola's method, from the purely artistic point of view, as a method which sacrifices vital truth by ignoring the perspective of life, are admirable and, it seems to us, unanswerable.

*The New York Herald.*

The book is a thoughtful and fair analysis of novels and novel readers, and a body of wise counsel as to what a book should contain besides a story.

*The New York Tribune.*

Mr. Thompson, in his ingenious and carefully-written essay, takes views of the philosophy of fiction with which we find ourselves in the main accordant.

*The New York Times.*

Mr. Thompson is perfectly familiar with a wide range of fiction, in English and French at least, and his illustrations are always apt.

*The Commercial Advertiser.*

The author is a philosopher who uses philosophy, not to promulgate preconceived theories, but to discover basal truths and to formulate correct hypotheses. His freedom from doctrinal bias puts him in the same mental attitude with the popular reader. To such a reader the results he has attained will seem reasonable, indeed would seem axiomatic were they not often contradicted or disregarded by doctrinaires.

*Public Opinion (New York).*

The author has contributed to the discussion of fiction in this volume in a very suggestive and valuable way. . . . His work is clear, comprehensive, sensible, and helpful.

*The Critic.*

His task he has well performed ; his method is free from pedantry, his attitude moderate and judicial.

*The Christian Union.*

Mr. Thompson is a very thoughtful writer who makes his appeal directly to thoughtful readers. . . . One of the most interesting chapters, and one of the most suggestive in the volume, is that on "Realism and Idealism," a chapter full of good sense, clear judgment, and excellent critical insight. . . . It is impossible not to recognize at every point the candor of his temper and the catholicity of his spirit.

*The Independent.*

Mr. Thompson, we are glad to see, has no sympathy with the demoralizing faction for whom morality ends where art begins. . . . His discussion of the question is bold, sincere, liberal, and broad.

*The Brooklyn Eagle.*

The work done by Mr. Thompson can scarcely be too highly valued.

*The Beacon (Boston).*

The book will be read to advantage by those who are concerned with the consumption, as well as with the production, of current novels and romances, and it holds up an artistic ideal which in these degenerate days is too often lost sight of.

*The Boston Globe.*

Mr. Thompson reaches the purest definition of the art and the purpose of fiction, and has something worth saying about it; something indeed that will refine the taste of all who listen to him. It is pleasant to follow him, for his thought is clean-cut and simple in expression.

*The Traveller (Boston).*

This book will be found to possess permanent literary value.

*The American (Baltimore).*

It is a concise, trenchant work, and the author has expressed himself, regardless of opinion, either favorable or otherwise.

*The Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

Mr. Thompson's work is replete with fine thought, the tone is elevated, and the style that of a scholar and a writer of taste.

*The Herald (Chicago).*

Mr. Thompson has written a work of supreme excellence, which cannot fail to be of value to every student of literature, no matter what his special vocation in that line may be.

*The Dial (Chicago).*

No more important contribution to literary criticism has been found in recent years than the essay, etc. . . . It is clean-cut, sensible (no mean praise), unprejudiced, sound. It treats plainly, yet justly, questions which the novelists or their admirers can never handle without showing the bias of a school. It is never dogmatic, never vacillating, yet is just to each and every coterie of fiction-producers.







